Early Talks

This section is a miscellaneous collection of talks and interviews from the late sixties and early seventies. Some of them have been published in pamphlet form.

Miscellaneous talks from the early days

Miscellaneous

11 Chapters

Year published: None

Early Talks

Chapter #1

Chapter title: None

3 June 1969 pm in Udaipur, India

[NOTE: Text is not available for this talk.]

Early Talks

Chapter #2

Chapter title: No Mission, No Message

1 October 1969 pm in Pahalgam, Kashmir, India

FIRST QUESTIONER: WHAT IS YOUR MISSION IN LIFE? AND WHAT METHOD SHOULD WE USE TO FULFILL THIS MISSION?

OSHO: As far as my mission in life is concerned, there is no such thing as my mission. Neither is there any my, nor is there any mission. I am not teaching something to others -- there is no message to be given to the world. Messages are many, missions are enough -- and there is no lack of missionaries, nor is there any lack of thoughts, ideologies, isms. On the contrary, the mind of the world is much too burdened with these things. To me it seems that if the mind of man can be unburdened, only then is there any possibility of living the truth, or of feeling life in its totality. Ideologies, thoughts, isms, missions, they all add to the burden of the mind.

The more the mind knows, the less it becomes capable of knowing; knowledge is the only hindrance towards knowing. Knowing is something quite different from knowledge. Knowledge means thoughts,

and knowledge means borrowed learning. Knowing means a mind which is unburdened of everything that is known; a mind in the state of knowing is simply ignorant -- it doesn't know anything, it is humble. And to be humble, one has to unlearn what has become a burden.

The known must cease for the unknown to be. And life is unknown, and truth is unknown, yet we are all burdened with knowledge. This attitude of knowledge becomes a hindrance towards the void, which goes into the unchartered, into the unknown, the unacquainted, the unlearnt.

So to me there is nothing to be preached or to be taught -- I am not a teacher in that sense. Rather, I am awakened -- not a teacher. And the first awakening that is required today is the awakening of the humble attitude of an unlearnt, unknowledgeable mind, a mind that is open and not closed.

This humility is needed but you cannot teach this humility through a mission, because a mission becomes an organization. A mission becomes, in the long run, the vested interest. A mission becomes a sect; a mission becomes interested, not in the unknown, but in the knowledge that the mission has to impart to others.

So every type of mission burdens the human mind. And the need is to be unburdened.

There are things which can be known by others; information can be imparted. As far as science is concerned -- the complete knowledge known as scientific knowledge -- there are things that can be imparted. Then there is the possibility of a school, of a teacher, of a mission.... But there are things as far as the inner is concerned... as far as the divine is concerned, and these things cannot be made part and parcel of a dead knowledge. They cannot be condensed into maxims, nor is there any possibility for any objective experimentation or for a laboratory where more than one person can experiment and come to a conclusion. There is no such possibility. The inner, the divine, is basically individual, is basically subjective. One knows, but cannot impart the knowledge to others. One knows and lives.... Others may feel the perfume, may feel the scent, may feel the song, may feel the unknown presence, but that too is intuitive, that too is indirect.

You cannot preach the divine directly, so there is no mission-like activity for me. When there is no mission, there is no question of how to work it out, how to implement it, how to organize it. I am against all sorts of organizations. Truth cannot be organized, and the moment one thinks of organizing it the truth is killed, only the dead remains. What is living goes out of any organization, because to know the truth is so individual, it cannot be organized. You can organize around an ideology, not around a realization. You can organize around a mission, not around the unknown, not around the realization of the unknown.

So there is no possibility of there being any organization around me. Nor am I interested... rather, I am against it. But we can never think of doing anything without organization. And the difficulty is: the very nature of the thing is so, that if you organize it, you kill it; and if you don't organize it, then you raise the problem, what to do with it? How to make others know about it? That too can only be done through individuals, not through organizations.

If what I say appeals to you, or somebody, he has to become the embodied presence of what I am saying. Even if one individual becomes the embodied presence and people begin to feel about him... something new, something transformed is imparted. By the very presence of such an individual the work goes on....

Only such a type of mission can I conceive of. But I cannot call it a mission because the very word has become associated with so many wrong things.

To be religious means to be imparting indirectly what one has realized. So I will go on trying, endeavoring to contact individuals personally, and indicating towards things which cannot be indicated. But no dead code or dead scripture must be allowed to be practiced or organized, or given a base -- unlike the old sects, the old religious or public organizations.

To me, organization means something based on hatred. No organization is centred around love, because love needs no organization. Hatred needs organization. Nations, parties, religions, are all based on hatred: hatred of others, hatred of those who are not in our fold, of those who are not under our flag, of those who are not convinced of our message. Hatred is such a great force, it organizes. It is so poisonous, and a single individual is not able to be so poisonous, a single individual cannot be as dangerous as hatred requires one to be. So one needs organizations, others, a crowd -- one cannot be alone.

But love is such a silent force, that to be alone is enough. Love doesn't know how to work, it works itself. There is no question of method -- I have never been concerned with method.

I am a man with no method -- absolutely no plan, no method, no organization. My only hope is this, that love works spontaneously. It needs no method. It needs no previous rehearsal. It works! And if it works it is alright, and if it doesn't work then too it is alright. If love is not enough, then no organization can be much more.

And love has never been methodological. Hatred has always been methodological. When You hate, you hate with a plan, you hate with a disciplined mind. You have to be conscious of the enemy, of the fear, of the planning of the opposite party. You cannot be spontaneous. With an enemy you are always to be prepared. You cannot be unprepared. But when there is no question of hatred, when there is no one to be thought of as an enemy, when there is only love to work and to live with, there is no question of tomorrow, there is no question of the future -- it is spontaneous, it works. And the very spontaneity is its force. If you don't plan your hatred, you will be defeated; but if you plan your love, you will also be defeated.

So, I have no plans for the future -- today is enough. This very moment passing, the present moment is enough. What I am doing, I am doing without any method. If it is something, if it is to be of any use for others, it will spread like fire without any method.

SECOND QUESTIONER: WHEN YOU SAY THAT KNOWLEDGE IS A HINDRANCE TO THE AWAKENING OF MAN, THEN WHAT TYPE OF KNOWLEDGE ARE YOU AWAKENING IN HIM? DO YOU WANT MAN TO BE ILLITERATE?

A: No, not illiterate. I am not saying that man should be illiterate, I am saying that man should always be ready: open, not closed. The knowledge that one has gained through the past must not become a hindrance to the future.

SECOND QUESTIONER: THAT IS KNOWLEDGE ABOUT RELIGIOUS THINGS ONLY?

A: Of course, of course. When I say knowledge, I always mean religious, because, really there is no such thing as knowledge which is not religious. Scientific knowledge only means scientific information. There is no scientific knowledge. It is only information -- so, it can be imparted. There is no such thing as scientific knowledge.

SECOND QUESTIONER: BUT IS THERE KNOWLEDGE ALSO IMPARTED BY SOMEBODY?

A: No. If it is imparted then it is not religious. Neither is it religious, nor is it knowledge. One has to know oneself. When it comes through others, it becomes dead. Then it becomes simply information, it is not religion. "Religious" means that which has been experienced, that which is existential, that which has been got through living not through scriptures, not through teachers -- not borrowed, but lived.

Religious knowledge is only knowledge. Why do I say so? Because science can know something about things. When science knows something, it knows something about it. It is always about and about; it is always an acquaintance from the outside. A scientist knowing a flower... he knows something about it! Everything that can be known about it, he knows. He tries to know more and more, but it always remains information. He has not gone into it, he has not become one with the flower. He has not known it from the inside, he has known it from the outside. Knowing from the outside is what I mean by information. Knowing from inside is what I mean by knowledge. And man can know only himself from the inside; everything else will be known from the outside. So only religious knowledge, knowledge which means a knowing of oneself, knowing the true inner reality... such knowledge only is true knowledge, because it knows, it is not information about oneself. But we can gain and cultivate information about ourselves. Then again it becomes non-religious. So, scriptures are not religious. They may be scientific or not scientific, but no scripture can be religious because it can only give information: it can give what Mahavira knows, what Buddha knows. I can know what Buddha knows, but that is not my knowledge.

SECOND QUESTIONER: HOW IS THAT A HINDRANCE?

It is a hindrance because when someone comes to conceive that he knows and really he does not know -- he has only been collecting information and this collection of inner information gives him a conception of knowledge -- then he won't try for further knowledge, then he won't try for himself. Then it will become a hindrance, because he has come to conclude that he knows, and really he doesn't know. This misconception of knowing will be the hindrance. And further, when the mind is enclosed in information - and there is much information around the mind, much knowledge, much scripture -- a barrier is erected between oneself and that which is. When you come to a flower, if you don't know anything

about it, you have to contemplate it. But if you know something about it, then you pass it by, because the barrier of knowledge... you know, I know about it: this is a rose, this is a beautiful flower, you say, and you pass on. There has been no living contact between that which is called the rose and the mind which is in a wrongly conceived enclosure of knowledge. There is no living contact. The rose can be known, not through any knowledge about the rose, but through the direct contact with its living existence. But still a rose is something outside. You cannot even think about yourSELF, because who is to think? And every type of information is a part of your thinking. It makes your mind a thinking machine. You go on thinking and thinking, and reading and reading, and you go around and around a concept. But if one is to know oneself, one has to cease to think. Because, the very thinking leads you afar.

SECOND QUESTIONER: THEN WE SHOULD NOT READ BOOKS ABOUT...?

No, I am not saying that. I am not saying that you should not read, neither am I saying that the information is of no use. I am not saying that. I am saying this: you must read, you must know, but you must know also that this knowing is simply information, and not knowledge for you. If you are aware of it, then it can't become a hindrance, then your mind is always open. You are always ready to learn, you are always ready to discover. Then you have not arrived, you are still searching, discovering. But a man of knowledge comes to think of himself, that he has arrived. A pundit, thinks of himself as a man who has arrived. Then there is no travel, then there is no mutation, then there is no transformation -- then there is no further search; the mind has become closed with knowledge. This may seem contradictory, but this is the truth: a mind that thinks it knows becomes incapable of knowing.

THIRD QUESTIONER: IT IS SAID, "AS YOU THINK, SO YOU BECOME." IF ONE THINKS OF THE REAL SELF....?

No! This is one of the very wrong conceptions. This conception says, that as you think so you become. No, you cannot become as you think. But you can feel that you have become something. As you think, you can feel that you have become something, you can imagine it. But imagination is not knowing. If someone thinks I am brahma, I am god, and goes on thinking it, and thinking and thinking, then he comes to feel that he is divine. But this feeling is not knowing. This is simply imagination being suggested, repeated, hypnotized. He has hypnotized himself by suggestions, by constant repetitions.

You cannot become what you think. Rather, the contrary is true: what you become you can think about. The becoming is first, the thinking is secondary -- because the being which you are is always behind the primary foundation of your thinking.

First you can exist without your thinking, but your thinking cannot exist without you. So you are foundational, the thinking is secondary. Thinking is only on the periphery, the circumference; your being is in the center. So one can be without any thoughts, but no thought can be without any being. If you think something and imagine something, you may come to a feeling -- imaginary, psuedo -- but you cannot come to your very being, because that which you don't know... how can you think about it? We can only think about something which we already know. If you know your self, then there is no question

of any thinking about yourself. If you don't know your self, then how can you think about it? Then you will borrow something from others....

SECOND QUESTIONER: KNOWING ONESELF WILL BE THINKING IT.

No! Knowing one self will be a total cessation of thinking; it will be simply existing in oneself -- not thinking. Thinking is always about something. Thinking cannot exist in a vacuum, it is always about something. You can think about a chair, you can think about a house, you can think about a friend or an enemy; you cannot think about yourself, because you are! Who is to think? So, if you are to know yourself, you have to cease completely -- totally -- the process of thinking....

The process of thinking must not be there then you are, in your simple authentic existence. Then you are, simply. Then you come to know that mind is not through thinking, that mind is through non-thinking. That's why I define meditation as a state of mind which is not thinking, but is aware -- not thinking and aware. There is no thinking in the mind, but the mind is, and is totally aware. So, about what can it be aware now? There is nothing to think, so it cannot go outside....

SECOND QUESTIONER: AWARENESS... IS IT ALWAYS SOMETHING IN CONTACT WITH OTHERS?

A: No, it is not. You can be simply aware. There is no need of...

SECOND QUESTIONER: AWARE OF WHAT?

A: Aware of yourself. You are aware of yourself. But these two things are one -- you and your awareness are not two things. When you are aware of your house, there are two things. But when you are aware of yourself, there is nothing which is aware, and nothing to be aware about -- you are the awareness. Then you are simply awareness. Then you are not aware, you are awareness, because there is only one thing: you and you and you, and awareness -- and nothing to be aware about. This moment, when you are not aware but you are awareness, is meditation. That awareness which is not aware of anything else; it simply exists, like light; it simply exists, like a flame.

SECOND QUESTIONER: WOULD IT BE JUST LIKE OBJECTIVE....?

A: No. When awareness becomes objective, when you become aware of something else, then it becomes thinking. Then thinking goes on, thinking is created.

FIRST QUESTIONER: WHEN YOU COME SUBJECTIVELY?

A: When you come subjectively, then there is no possibility of any thinking.

THIRD QUESTIONER: HOW DO YOU DEFINE, ATMA CHINTAN?

A: There is no such thing as self-thinking, atma chintan. You cannot be in a state when you are thinking about yourself, because one who knows, knows; he never thinks about it. We only think about things which we don't know... you go on thinking. But one can know oneself through borrowed knowledge; then, one can think about oneself. Then one can think about atma and the nature of the self, the existence of the self, the origin of the self... one can go on thinking about it. But this is not knowing.

In meditation, you are not thinking about yourself, you are knowing. And the moment of knowing is the moment of explosion. The mind is exploded -- you become something else. You are not the old man, you are not the old person. The old person has gone, a new man has come into being. Now this man lives in a totally different way, exists in a totally different way, loves in a different way, is in a different way because he has come to know himself. The first point of knowledge has been achieved. Now he can know others too....

We are in a dilemma. We don't know ourselves, and we think that we know others. We are trying to know others without knowing ourselves. This is impossible. If I am ignorant of my own self, how can I know anything else in the world? The very center is ignorant, the very person is in darkness, so how can I discover light anywhere else? -- it has not been discovered in me!

The first point of discovery, the first explosion of light, must be, can only be in me. Then it spreads, then it goes out and out and out. This first moment of transformation is self-knowing. Then like a pebble thrown in a lake, the circles go on spreading and spreading. Then they will go on up to the bank. The explosion is in the self, but then the explosion goes on encircling the whole world. It goes to the very end, and then it becomes divine knowledge.

First the explosion is self-knowledge, then the explosion goes, goes, goes to the infinite and becomes divine knowledge. Self-knowledge is the door, is the opening towards the divine. But we do not know ourselves, and we think we know even God. We debate about it, we struggle about it, we discuss it, we confute, refute, convince... we say this is right, this is wrong, this religion is right, that religion is wrong, this scripture is accurate, that scripture is not accurate, we go on debating and discussing things for which, in ourselves there is no opening.

The opening comes through the explosion of the self.

One thing more to be understood: The explosion is the explosion of your ego also. When you know, when you come to know yourself -- this is a miracle and this is a mystery -- the self remains only in ignorance. The self is part of the ignorance. We say self-knowledge, but really when the knowing comes,

the self goes. There is no self then. Then there is only knowing. Then you are not. Then there is only existence, then there is only being. That being is atman.

Atman is not the self, the ego. One thing to be understood: You cannot know yourself, because the moment you come to know, you are not there, only the knowing remains. And that knowing without an ego, goes to the very endless end. Because there is no boundary now.

THIRD QUESTIONER: THEN, THE WORDS ATMA SAKSHATKAR HAVE NO MEANING FOR YOU?

A: Really, all these words are conceived dualistically. In fact, there is nothing like atma sakshatkar, "realization of the self," because when the realization is, self is not, and when the self is, realization is not. So "realization of the self"... these are two contradictory terms.

It is like this: If there is darkness in the room, there is darkness. Then you bring a lamp to know darkness. You bring a lamp because, in the darkness, how one can know what darkness is? So you go out and you come back with a lamp to know the darkness. But when there is the lamp, there is no darkness! Yet when there was no lamp, there was darkness. So there is no enlightening of the darkness. There is no such thing as darkness seen in the light. There is no such thing.

There is no such thing as self realized. Self is ignorance; when you come to realize that which is, there is no self.

Buddha was more accurate in his expressions. He said, "realization of no-self." That is exactly nearer to the reality than realization of the self -- realization of no-self, an enlightening of no-darkness, because when the realization comes, there is no self. So Buddha says that no self is the reality. That could not be understood; it is very difficult. He said: existence of no self, anatman. There is no atman, there is anatman. And he meant something, something meaningful. But he could not be understood. We can understand atman because it approximates the ego. We can think about the self because it is something like an extended ego, a bigger ego.... So we can conceive of it....

THIRD QUESTIONER: BUDDHA SAYS "NO ATMAN"...

A: Buddha says no atman.

THIRD QUESTIONER: MAHAVIRA SAYS THERE IS ATMAN.

A: Mahavira says there is atman, but without the ego: there is no ego -- atman is. Buddha says there is no atman. And the reality is they mean the same thing.

But I say, Buddha's expression more approximates the reality, yet Mahavira's expression is more likely to be understood by all. The expression is different; but they mean the same thing. Mahavira says, there is self but no ego: When you realize the no-ego, you will know the self. Buddha says, there is no self. When you realize this, you will know existence, you will know the being, you will come to know.... And if you ask Buddha what we will come to know, what will be realized, he'd say, realize and know, because when you ask what, you have again asked a dualistic question. You are again asking aware of what? So Buddha says come to awareness, and then you will know there is awareness but you will not know anything about it.

That awareness is freedom.

THIRD QUESTIONER: UP TILL NOW WE HAVE HEARD YOU ON MAHAVIRA AND BUDDHA, OR ON THE ATMAN. CAN YOU ENLIGHTEN US ABOUT CHRIST'S OF THE ATMAN? HAS HE GIVEN ANY LIGHT ON THIS?

A: Not in such a way as to be compared with Buddha or Mahavira. Jesus speaks a totally different language. Jesus' language is totally different, he talks about the Kingdom of God.

THIRD QUESTIONER: HE ALSO CAME TO A STATE OF ENLIGHTENMENT HIMSELF?

A: He came, he came... he understands. He realized what any Buddha or any Mahavira realized. But the language is completely different. The language is not Indian.

First, the language is not philosophical. Second, the language is Jewish, conceived in a Jewish frame, with parables, with metaphors, with stories. And if one is going to understand Jesus' territory, then one has to imbibe the spirit of Jewish thinking. They don't talk about the self, they talk about the kingdom of God. They say: we are as we are, we don't know about the kingdom of God. Whatever the kingdom of God means, we do not know anything about it. We are unneccessarily poor, we are unneccessarily beggars. In the innermost parts of ourselves there is a kingdom and if we go in, the kingdom will be revealed, and we will then be children of God -- not beggars, not crippled with desire, not crippled with misery, we will be bliss. This kingdom of God is the same as what Mahavira calls atman, Buddha calls no-atman. This is the same, but Jesus speaks in parables: he calls it the kingdom of God.

SECOND QUESTIONER: WHAT ABOUT KRISHNA?

A: The same. Those who have realized....

SECOND QUESTIONER: WHAT DOES HE SAY ABOUT THIS?

A: He says the same thing. He calls it brahma: when you surrender yourself.... Krishna says surrender yourself to me. To me means to the ultimate, surrender yourself to the ultimate. Surrender yourself to the ultimate and you will become one with it. Because what one knows, becomes what he knows. But the question is of surrendering. Then it's the same. Mahavira says, egolessness. But how can you be egoless without surrendering? These are two things taken from two different points of view but coming to the same place. To be egoless means to be surrendered, completely surrendered. A person who has completely surrendered himself becomes egoless. And when one becomes egoless, one realizes the truth, because the ego is not there to be a hindrance, to be a covering. Krishna emphasises surrendering, samarpan, sarva dharman parapechii, mamekam sharanam, prarchi(?): leave all, and come to me totally surrendered. But this me means the ultimate, this me is not Krishna.

THIRD QUESTIONER: THE ULTIMATE MEANS....?

A: God, the Divine, the real, the truth, the atman, whatsoever one may name it -- Krishna emphasises surrendering, Buddha emphasises no-self, Mahavira emphasises egolessness, Jesus, the kingdom of God, the bliss. He talks about the bliss, ananda, the kingdom... and the poverty in which we live....

SECOND QUESTIONER: WHAT WAS....?

A: Ananda -- happiness. Happiness unbounded, happiness unlimited, happiness infinite.

Whosoever may have realized, whosoever may have reached, the question is not that one says this and the other says that -- this and that mean the same thing. If one has realized and the other has not realized, then even this and that cannot mean the same.

This is to be understood: A person who has realized, he may say whatsoever he likes. He cannot say against it... anyone who has realized. But a person who has not realized may say, "this is what I mean, this is what you are saying, I am totally convinced of it." But he cannot mean the same, because the same has not been experienced.

Words cannot convey the experience. But anti-words can convey.... If the person is a person of knowing, anti-words can convey. Mahavira says, "Self is the only thing. To know the Self is the aim, to realize the Self is all." Buddha says quite the contrary: "To know the self is ignorance."

These two statements quite contradictory, quite opposite to one another, mean the same thing. But if someone says, God is, and another, too, says God is, and if the persons concerned are persons who do not know what God means, these two statements -- similiar, exactly similiar: GOD IS -- these two statements cannot mean the same. The two persons and their experience and their ignorance and their definitions, are different. They have not come to the point where individuality dissolves.

Unless individuality is dissolved, we cannot come to the same experience, because the difference is not in the experience, it is in our personality, our individuality: I. My I gives meaning to my words, your I gives meaning to your words, and your I and my I are two different things, they can't mean the same thing. But a Buddha has no I, a Mahavira has no I, a Jesus has no I. So they cannot mean different things, because the difference was created by the I. They can give different expressions, but they cannot mean different things. For us, this becomes a dilemma. This has become a very difficult job for the human mind to conceive, that Jesus, Buddha, Mahavira, Mohammed, Krishna, they all mean the same thing. Then... then what is the foundation of Hinduism, of Mohammedism, of Jainism, of Christianity?

In reality, there is no foundation. These all are conceived in ignorance. We have not understood what Jesus means, therefore there is Christianity. We have not understood what Mahavira means, therefore there is Jainism. These are misunderstandings -- words with different meanings that we have conceived as if the experiences were different. So there are different sects.

To me, there is no difference, the difference is only of name. One is Krishna: if you wash off the name... one is Mahavira, and if you wash off the name, and the two persons were here, nameless, you could not see the difference. Where is the difference? There is no difference. But the name for us means much. Krishna, Jesus, Buddha, the names are more important to us than the reality for which those names stood.

If one goes deeper, one comes to know the source is one. These things may differ, the paths may differ, but the reaching point is the same. Those who were realized come to know the one reality. Those who were not realized, conceive their own realities individually.

We create our own realities, our own philosphies.

Another question has been asked,

WHAT IS YOUR PHILOSOPHY?

I have got no philosophy at all. Because philosophy means how I define reality. Philosophy means how I systematize the real, what I say about reality.

The first thing I say is that the reality cannot be said, cannot be expressed. How do I define it? I never define it, because definitions can only be in words. You cannot define love. You can know it, you can feel it, you can live it, you can suffer it, but you cannot define it. How can you define love? How can you define prayer? You can be in prayer, there are moments when you are in prayer, but you cannot define it. All that is beautiful, all that is true, all that is good, cannot be defined. It can only be experienced?

So I have got no philosophy.

SECOND QUESTIONER: SO, WHEN YOU EXPERIENCE SOMETHING THEN YOU CAN DEFINE IT, CERTAINLY?

A: No! Even then you cannot define it! You can only express it... falteringly. You can't define it. You can express it falteringly, and a person who knows will always say categorically... he will say that what I am saying is not what I have experienced. Because words convey so differently....

It is like this:

You have come to a lake; you have seen the sun rise and you have gone back. Now someone asks: define the beauty, define the sunrise! What do you mean that you have experienced a beautiful scene? What do you mean that you have become exhilarated? What do you mean? Then he says, please paint that sunrise. And you begin to paint. You paint a sunrise: a sun, -- with a pencil -- a lake, hills, but then you see the difference. It was something living, but this is something dead. That was something miraculous, this is a sketch. A circle, and you say this is the sun? A circle drawn with a pencil, you say this is the sun?

SECOND QUESTIONER: THE DRAWING MAY DIFFER, BUT THE EXPRESSION CAN BE SHARED...?

A: The drawing too is an expression... and it could be more approximate, more real, even more real than words -- because words are more abstract.

SECOND QUESTIONER: BUT IT CANNOT BE WRONG? THE EXPRESSION...?

A: That is not the question, that is not the question. I am not saying that it is wrong. I am not saying that it is incorrect, I am saying it is something so faint....

SECOND QUESTIONER: ... EXPRESS IT FALTERINGLY?

A: I said falteringly. A person who has seen the sun rise, may understand something from your sketch. But a person who has not seen any sunrise, he cannot conceive of what you mean. This circle with a pencil, this is the sun? This is beautiful, you say? How nonsensical! How can this circle with a pencil be beautiful?

It can convey something only if the person concerned has experienced it -- then there is no question, then it is symbolic, then it can be conveyed. But then there is no need! A person who has known the sunrise, he will understand when you say you have seen a beautiful sunrise. He will say okay, alright, he won't ask you to define it: "Draw a sketch, because I have not seen it, so I may understand by your definitions...." But if you have seen it and then you draw it, you know something has gone wrong. Something has gone wrong. It is something so faint, that it would have been better not to draw it, because it will convey something which you are not meaning to convey. You could say this is a sketch, but no comparison can be made. Even I myself cannot say this is beautiful. Something else was there -- living; this is something dead.

And a sun is a physical object. There is a possibility that you may not be able to draw it, but you can have a photograph -- that would be more, real. You can have a color photograph, then it would be more real. Still it is an objective experience.

But a person who comes from the divine, cannot bring a photograph with him, cannot have a color photograph. He comes from a vacuum. When he faces us, he is in one of the most difficult states. He knows something, he has known it, and now you are confronting him, encountering him, asking him, and he is at a loss. He is nowhere. He cannot concieve of how to say it....

So there have been many realized persons for whom the very impossiblity of defining the experience has led them to be silent. They have remained silent.

THIRD QUESTIONER: JESUS HAS SAID THAT THOSE WHO HAVE EARS, LET THEM HEAR. WHAT DOES HE MEAN BY THAT?

A: He means something. He means something which... he means that only having ears doesn't mean that you can hear. Only having eyes doesn't mean that you can see, because there are things which cannot be seen by the eyes. There are things which are seen with closed eyes, there are things which are heard with closed ears.

A person who has heard things not heard by ears comes to you, says something, and says this: if you have ears...? You will say, what nonsense you are talking about? I have got ears, I have got eyes... But he says I have seen something which was not seen by eyes, but I have seen it, and seen more exactly than any eye can see. If you have eyes -- those eyes which are not these eyes, those ears which are not these ears.... So Jesus says, "Listen, hearken -- but only those who have ears, who have eyes, can see."

There are eyes which can be opened. But if you think these are all, that these eyes are the only implements, instruments of perfection, then you are losing a greater world -- because there are things unseen by these eyes, which can be seen, which can be heard, which can be felt, which can be known. That's what he says. It is the same thing.

SECOND QUESTIONER: THAT REALIZATION STATE?.... HOW TO AVOID THINKING WHILE REMAINING IN THE WORLD, AND KNOWING YOUR OWN SELF?

A: No, you cannot avoid. You cannot escape, because what you avoid follows you, and what you escape from, in a very deep sense you become involved with.

So don't escape, don't avoid. Thinking is, be aware of it. For some moments, sit quietly, be aware of the thinking, be aware of the process: thoughts are coming, thoughts are going... like breath coming and going, coming and going constantly -- there is a continuity. See it; just see it. Stand aside, be aware of it. Thoughts are going... this thought has come, that has gone, see it, know it. Notice it, but don't condemn, don't say this is good, don't say this is bad. Don't choose. Just be aware. Like a person standing on a

street: people are going and coming, the street is running, there is a crowd, traffic, and a person is standing, is just watching. So just see the process.

By and by, the more you become alert, awake, the more you begin to see thoughts, the more you will come to feel intervals. A thought will come, then it has gone and another thought has not yet come... there is an interval. There is a gap -- a little gap. But in that gap there is no thought. So the more alert you become, you will feel the intervals.

Those intervals will be first glimpses of the self -- first glimpses. But glimpses. Just glimpses come and gone.

But go on! Those glimpses will be so blissful, that they will invite you more and more towards the inner. And the more you become alert, conscious, thoughts will be coming less and less -- it is in proportion. The less alert, the more thinking; the more alert, the less thinking. The proportion goes like this: the more you become conscious, thoughts come less and less. For some time the road becomes vacant and you dip in, you go in. If you continue this -- this awareness, being a witness to your mind -- then there comes a time... no one can predict it -- it is unpredictable but it comes.... Then some day you feel that there are no thoughts.

The thought process has completely ceased and you are transformed to somewhere else, somewhere you have never been. A door has opened, you have gone in. You are not even conscious of going in -- you have gone. You know the change, the transformation, the transcendence -- you have transcended. Then you come back, but you are a totally different person. Then you live in this very life, but quite differently. Then your everything has changed. It has become more intimate, more loving, more compassionate, you have become a loving, a truthful, a silent, a peaceful, an aware mind. And everything that was associated with ignorance, conflict, tension, all have gone. Something has been achieved which has led you towards the source. You have become one with it. Then you live blissfully in every moment, in every circumstance, in every condition, in every situation, something silent and blissful accompanies you like a shadow.

That is the bliss. It is that we have been longing -- for births. That has been the longing, but we have searched for it somewhere else, where it is not. We have been longing for it... in love we have been longing for it, in richness we have been longing for it, in everything that we desire, we have been longing for it. But the search has gone astray, not in the right direction. It has gone outward. And the more we have gone outward, the less has become the possibility of the bliss for which we are searching, for which we are desiring.

SECOND QUESTIONER: THEN, THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE ARE WASTING THEIR TIME IN WORLDLY AFFAIRS, DOING THIS AND DOING THAT... GOING TO THE MOON?

A: Those things may be meaningful in another way, in another sense. But as far as the bliss is concerned, they are all useless. They are irrelevant -- not relevant to the basic search, the basic urge, the basic thirst of humanity. That is somewhere inside. And you come inside when thought ceases. With thought, the known ceases, the knowledge ceases. With thought the wandering ceases. With thought, everything

outward ceases -- thought is the foundation of all that is outward. You come in -- really, you have never been out, but with the association of thought you have imagined yourself to be out. When I say you come in, you really don't come in, you have always been in, but for the first time you are disassociated from the outside. You realize what has been always yours.

Early Talks

Chapter #3

Chapter title: None

26 August 1970 pm in CCI Chambers, Bombay, India

[NOTE: Text is not available for this talk.]

Early Talks

Chapter #4

Chapter title: None

22 September 1970 pm in CCI Chambers, Bombay, India

[NOTE: Text is not available for this talk.]

Early Talks

Chapter #5

Chapter title: None

2 October 1970 pm in Manali, India

[NOTE: Text for this talk is not available.]

Early Talks

Chapter #6

Chapter title: None

Published in the Osho Times 1990

DHRITARASHTRA SAID:

O SANJAY, ASSEMBLED ON THE FIELD OF RIGHTEOUSNESS, THE FIELD OF THE KURUS, AND EAGER TO FIGHT, WHAT DID MY SONS AND THE SONS OF PANDU DO?

Dhritarashtra is blind. However, longing or passionate desire never disappears because of the lack of sight. If Surdas had thought of Dhritarashtra, he would not have pierced his eyes.

Surdas pierced his eyes in the belief that the desire and longing would never crop up once sight was destroyed. But desire does not arise through eyes, it arises out of mind. Longing would never end even if one lost one's sense-organs.

This wonderful tale of the Gita begins with a blind man's curiosity. In fact, there would not be a single tale in this world if there were not blind men. All the tales and stories of this life begin with a blind man's curiosity. A man without sight also wants to see that which he cannot see; a deaf person wants to hear that which he cannot hear. Thus, even if all the sense-organs are lost, there is no end to desires hidden in the mind.

At the outset, I would like to remind you that Dhritarashtra is blind. Nevertheless, though miles away, his mind is curious; he is curious and troubled to know what is happening on the battlefield. Remember that blind Dhritarashtra had one hundred sons; however, children born of a blind person can never have real vision, although they may have eyes. Those who are born of blind parents -- and perhaps people generally are born of blind parents -- may have outer eyes, but it is difficult for them to gain inner sight. Secondly, it is important to understand that the hundred sons of Dhritarashtra were acting blindly in every sense. They had outer eyes but not inner ones. One who is blind can only beget blindness, and yet, this father is curious to know, "What is happening...?"

Thirdly, one should note what Dhritarashtra is saying, "In that righteous land of the Kurus, men who have assembled to engage in the battle..." The land of righteousness ceases to exist the day people come there to fight a war. Similarly, the day fighting becomes imperative in the field of religion the possibility of its survival also comes to an end. Thus, at one time it may have been a land of righteousness, but now it is not. Now people who are eager to kill each other have come together on that very field known as the land of righteousness -- dharmakshetra.

This beginning is really strange. It is strange in the sense that then it would be difficult, for example, to imagine what must be happening in the lands of unrighteousness. Dhritarashtra is asking Sanjay, "What is happening in the land of righteousness? I want to know what my sons and their opponents, who are eager to fight, are doing."

Perhaps the land of righteousness has not been created yet on this earth; if it had, there would not be any possibility of war. When the possibility of war still exists, and when even a land of righteousness is turned into a battlefield, then how can we blame or criticize that which is unrighteous? The truth is that

perhaps there have been less wars in the domains of unrighteousness as compared to the domains of righteousness or religion.

If we were to think in terms of war and bloodshed, then the lands of righteousness would look more like unrighteous lands than the actual lands of unrighteousness. One should understand the irony involved here -- that up to now, wars have taken place in the field of righteousness. Do not think that he temples and mosques have become dens of war only today. Thousands of years ago, when it is generally believed that good people lived on the earth -- and a wonderful person like Krishna was present -- even then people had gathered to fight in he righteous land of the Kurus This very deep rooted thirst for war, this very deeply ingrained desire for destruction, this very deeply hidden animal in man remains with him even in the land of righteousness. This animal makes preparation for war even in the holy land. It is good to remember his; and also that there is a greater danger in fighting from behind the shield of religion because then it seems justified.

So, this religious scripture begins with the curiosity of the blind Dhritarashtra. All religious scriptures begin with a blind man's curiosity. In fact, religious scriptures will not be needed the day blind nen will disappear from this world. Thus, here, it is a blind man who is curious.

BELOVED OSHO,

SANJAY, WHO IS THE REPORTER OF THE WAR TO DHRITARASHTRA, WHAT IS HIS ROLE IN THE GITA? DID SANJAY POSSESS POWERS OF CLAIRVOYANCE OR CLAIRAUDIENCE? WHAT IS THE ORIGINAL SOURCE OF HIS MENTAL-POWER? COULD THIS POWER BE SELF-CREATED?

Doubts have been raised consistently regarding Sanjay, which is natural. From a very long distance Sanjay reports to Dhritarashtra what is happening in Kurukshetra.

Yoga has always believed that the eyes we see with are not the only eyes. Man also has other eyes which can see across the barriers of time and space. The doubt that arises in our minds is -- how can Sanjay see across such a long distance? Is he omniscient? No. The first thing is that this clairvoyance is not really such a great power. It has nothing to do with being omniscient. It is a very small power, and any individual can cultivate it with a little effort. Sometimes it happens that as a result of some quirk in nature this power develops more easily in someone.

There is a person in America by the name of Ted Cereo. I would like to mention a couple of things about this man which will help in understanding Sanjay. Let us forget Sanjay for a while, because Sanjay is far removed in time from us. And no one knows from which unfortunate moment we began to take our ancient scriptures as imaginary.

Ted Cereo, who is alive in America, is able to see anything across a distance of thousands of miles. Not only can he see, but his eyes can even capture the images seen by him. If asked to see what is taking place at this ground of Ahmedabad where we are having this discussion, Ted Cereo, sitting in New York, would remain with his eyes closed for five minutes. Upon opening his eyes, your photograph or picture can be seen in his eyes by others. The image in his eye can even be photographed by a camera. Thousands of such photographs have been taken, and the fact is that Ted Cereo's eyes can capture any

picture from any distance. His eyes can not only see but can also capture the image. This incidence of Ted Cereo makes it clear that Sanjay is not omniscient; because Ted Cereo is a very ordinary man, he is not a self-realized person. Ted Cereo has no idea of soul. There is no saintliness in the life of this man, but he has a power by which he can see across long distances. It is of course a very special power.

Some days ago a Scandinavian man was thrown out of a car in an accident in which his head was injured. When he came to his senses in the hospital he could not believe what he was hearing -- he heard someone singing. For a while he thought he was going crazy! In a day or two the whole matter became clear. There was a radio station within a ten-mile radius, and his ears were picking up the radio frequency. Later, his ears were thoroughly checked but nothing unusual was found. However it was discovered that as a result of the blow received in the car accident, some hidden power of the ear had become active. He was put through an operation since there was no way the music in his ears could be turned on or turned off.

A couple of years ago a lady in England began to see stars m broad daylight. This was also the result of an accident. She fell from a roof and began to see stars in daytime. Stars are there of course during the day, they never disappear; it is simply that they are over-powered by the sunlight. When the light is gone in the evening they are visible again. Our eyes could see stars in daytime if they could penetrate the sunlight. The eyes of that lady were also operated on.

I have mentioned all this to point out that eyes have hidden powers too which can make one see stars in daytime. Powers are also hidden in the ears through which one can receive sounds transmitted from a distant radio station. There are powers hidden in the eyes which can see across the limits of time and space. But these powers have not much to do with spirituality.

So it is not that Sanjay is some kind of spiritual man, although he is certainly a unique individual. He is able to see what is going on far away on the battleground. And it is not that he had attained to any God or truth because of this power. On the contrary, it is quite possible that Sanjay may have met his end because of using this power.

This happens very often. Special powers generally lead people astray. That is why yoga has consistently maintained that whether it be common

This happens very often. Special powers generally lead people astray. That is why yoga has consistently maintained that whether it be common physical powers, or whether it be psychic powers of the mind, one who gets entangled in these powers never reaches the truth.

What Sanjay could do, however, is possible. Recently, within the last one hundred years in the West, a great deal of work has happened in psychic research. Now no one has any reason to doubt Sanjay -- not even on scientific grounds. Not only in a country such as America, which believes in religion, but even in Russia psychologists are admitting the endless powers inherent in man.

Recently, as a result of landing on the moon, Russian and American psychologists have been assigned a new job, because it is no longer possible to completely depend on machines. Particularly in the case where people are sent to travel in space, a terrible risk is involved. With a slight defect in the machinery we could lose them forever, and it would be impossible to trace these lost travelers. We would never be able to locate them in infinite space, or know whether they are alive or dead. That is why the scientists of Russia and America are anxiously working in their laboratories to develop a substitute system which

would enable one to see across a long distance, hear and send messages without the help of technology. It will not be very long before Russia and America both will have Sanjays -- of course, we in India will not have any!

So, Sanjay is not necessarily a spiritual man. However, he does have a special power that we all possess and which can be developed.

Hearing this, Sanjay said: Then, the king Duryodhana having seen the army of the Pandavas drawn up for the battle, approached Dronacharya his teacher and said these words:

O Teacher, behold this mighty army of Pandu's sons which the son of Drupada, Dhrishtadyumna, your own clever pupil, has drawn up strategically.

Here are brave warriors, great archers, those equal to Bheema and Arjuna -- Yuyudhana, Virata and Drupada the great fighter.

Also, Dhrishtaketu, Chekitana, and the valiant king of Kashi; Purujit, Kuntibhoja, and the best among men -- the king of the Shibis.

VALIANT YUDHAMANYU AND POWERFUL UTTAMAUJA, SUBHADRA'S SON ABHIMANYU, AS WELL AS ALL THE FIVE SONS OF DRAUPADI; ALL OF THEM ARE GREAT WARRIORS.

ALSO KNOW, O FOREMOST AMONG BRAHMINS, THE OUTSTANDING MEN ON OUR SIDE, THE LEADERS OF MY ARMY. I WILL MENTION THEM NOW FOR YOUR INFORMATION.

When the human mind is troubled by an inferiority complex, when the human mind considers itself inferior from within, then one always begins to talk by boasting about one's greatness. But, when there are no such inferior individuals, talk will always begin with the mention of other's greatness.

Here Duryodhana is telling Dronacharya which powerful warriors have assembled in the army of the Pandavas. That Duryodhana begins with this is highly symbolic. Generally, a talk under such circumstances does not begin with praise of the enemy -- but here, Duryodhana begins his talk by identifying the heroes who have assembled in the enemy's army. This shows that whatever else Duryodhana may be, he is certainly not a man with an inferiority complex.

It is very interesting that even a good man, if affected by an inferiority complex, is worse than a bad man who is not affected by it. Only one who is confident of himself can begin by praising others. This is the fundamental difference that has emerged within the past centuries. There were bad as well as good

people before. It is not that today the number of bad people has increased and that of good people decreased -- there are as many bad people today as there are good people. Then what is the difference?

Those who talk about religion spread the idea that in the old days people were good; now they have become bad. In my view this contention is fundamentally wrong. There have always been good and bad people -- the difference between the two is not so superficial. rather, it is much deeper. Before, even a bad person was not affected by an inferiority complex, while today even a good person is troubled by an inferiority complex. Here lies the deep difference.

Today, even the best man is good only outwardly, inside even he is not sure of himself. Remember, if one has no confidence in himself, his goodness is not of a kind which can survive for long. It is merely skin-deep; a little scratch, and ugliness will appear on the surface. If a bad person is self-assured despite his being evil he can be changed, because a very crystalized quality of goodness lies at the base -- the quality of self-assuredness.

I find it very significant that a bad person such as Duryodhana begins his talk in a good manner. He mentions the good qualities of his opponents first, and then he describes the heroes in his own army.

FIRST YOURSELF, THEN BHEESHMA, KARNA, AND THE EVER VICTORIOUS IN BATTLE KRIPA; ASHWATTHAMA, VIKARNA, AND ALSO THE SON OF SOMADATTA, BHURISHRAVA.

Many other heroes, as well who are ready to lay down their lives for me. They are armed with various kinds of weapons, and are very well skilled in war.

Our army, in every way, is invincible and is guarded by Bheeshma, while theirs which is guarded by Bheema is easy enough for us to defeat.

THEREFORE, STANDING FIRM IN ALL THE FRONTS, EACH IN HIS RESPECTIVE PLACE, GUARD BHEESHMA ALONE EVERYONE OF YOU.

BELOVED OSHO,

ON THE ONE HAND WE FIND THAT IN SHREEMAD BHAGAVADGITA THE TOTAL EMPHASIS IS ON ARJUNA, WHILE HERE DURYODHANA SAYS, "PANDAVAS' ARMY IS PROTECTED BY BHEEMA, AND THE KAURAVAS' BY BHEESHMA..." COULD IT BE THAT BY PITTING BHEEMA AGAINST BHEESHMA, DURYODHANA IS INDICATING THAT HE CONSIDERS BHEEMA AS HIS ONLY TRUE RIVAL?

This point needs to be looked into. The whole war is centered around Arjuna, but this is in hindsight -- that is, after the war, at the conclusion of the war. Those who know the outcome of the war would say

that Arjuna was pivotal throughout the war. But those who were standing at the threshold of war could never have perceived this.

For Duryodhana, the possibility of a real war rested upon Bheema. There were reasons for this. Even Duryodhana could never have depended upon a nice person like Arjuna for engaging in a war such as this. Duryodhana too has doubts in his mind regarding the steadiness of Arjuna. Duryodhana has some deep, unconscious feeling that Arjuna might desert the battlefield. Thus his understanding seems to be that if this war should proceed at all, it will be because of Bheema alone. People like Bheema who are less intelligent but more powerful can be depended upon for fighting a war.

Arjuna is intelligent; and where there is intelligence there is doubt, and where there is doubt there is conflict. Arjuna is rational; and where there is rationality, there lies the capability for thinking from a total perspective. With these qualities it is difficult for one to enter the dangerous state of war with closed eyes.

Duryodhana can depend upon Bheema to have a war. There is a deep similarity between them. Both are of the same nature; deep down both have the same kind of thinking, both are the same type of person. Hence if Duryodhana saw Bheema as the central figure on the opposing side, he was absolutely right. Gita also proves later on that Arjuna is eager to desert. Arjuna appears as an escapist, which is highly possible with regard to a person like him. The war has proved tougher for Arjuna. For Arjuna, entering in war became possible only after he underwent a transformation. Only after attaining a new level of understanding could he agree to the war.

Bheema was prepared to fight at whatever level of being he was. He accepted war as naturally as did Duryodhana; hence, it is not coincidental that Duryodhana should see Bheema as the central figure. But this matter comes up at the beginning of the war, and Duryodhana does not know how the war is going to conclude, what the end will be -- but we know.

Remember, often life does not end the way it begins. Very often it ends undecided; it is always invisible. Mostly what we think will occur does not occur, what we believe will happen does not happen. Life is an unknown journey. Hence, whatever is thought at the initial moments of life, or at the initial moments of any event, does not come true at the end. We can be involved in building our fate but we can never be the judge of it.

Duryodhana's idea was precisely that Bheema would be the central figure, and if Bheema had remained central, perhaps what Duryodhana said about being victorious would have come true. That Duryodhana's viewpoint did not prove true, and an unexpected element came into the picture, is worth some thought.

Krishna had no idea that he would be able to bring Arjuna back into the war if he decided to desert. We, too, never know that the unknown divine may also have a hand in making things happen in life. Our calculations are about that which is visible. We never know that at some point the invisible might also penetrate, that the invisible might also enter in the midst of everything.

Here, in the midst of all, the invisible has entered in the form of Krishna, and consequently the whole story has taken a different turn. That which could have happened did not happen; and that which had the least possibility of happening took place. There can be no prediction of the arrival of the unknown.

That is why the first-time reader of this tale cannot but be shocked when he finds Krishna drawing the escaping Arjuna back into the war -- certainly the reader is shocked.

When Emerson read this tale for the first time, he closed the book; he was horrified. Because what Arjuna was saying there would be acceptable to all so-called religious people. The argument Arjuna was making was exactly that of a so-called religious person. When Henry Thoreau came across this situation and found that Krishna was counseling Arjuna to enter into war, he too was horrified. Henry Thoreau has written that he never believed, he did not have the slightest idea, that the story would take such a turn -- Krishna counseling Arjuna to enter into war. Gandhi, too, faced the same difficulty, he was troubled because of the same reason.

But life never proceeds according to set principles. Life is a very wonderful thing. It never runs on railway tracks, rather it flows like a current of the river Ganges -- its course is never predetermined. And when God appears in the midst of all, he disturbs everything. Whatever was ready, whatever man had made, whatever man thought -- everything turns upside down.

Duryodhana had never imagined that the divine would enter into war. Hence what he is saying is just an initial statement of the kind we all make in the early stages of our lives. Meanwhile, the unknown keeps intervening and the entire story changes. If we could see our lives in hindsight, we might say that whatever we intended went wrong. Where we expected success, we met failure; what we had our hearts set on was never attained. Happiness was expected by gaining something, which when we got it, led to sorrow; and that which we never dreamed of having, the mere glimpse of it burst open fountains of joy and happiness. Everything becomes topsy-turvy.

There are very few intelligent people in this world who would take into consideration the outcome first. We pay attention to the beginning first. If we could just take the end into consideration first, the story of life could be very different.

However, if Duryodhana should take into account the end first, there can never be the war. Duryodhana can never take the end into consideration. He would take the end for granted. That is why he says over and over again that although the army is great on the other side, the final victory will be his -- that his soldiers are eager to make him victorious even at the cost of their lives.

Even if we may apply our whole strength, the untruth can never be victorious -- Duryodhana could not sense this certainty. And the truth, which initially might appear as losing, wins in the end. The untruth appears to be winning initially, but meets defeat in the end. Truth appears to lose in the beginning but becomes victorious in the end. But how can one possibly see the end from the start? One who sees becomes religious. One who fails to see keeps on slipping, like Duryodhana, into a blind war.

BELOVED OSHO,

ON THE ONE HAND THERE IS THE WILL OF THE UNKNOWN, AND ON THE OTHER THERE IS THE WILL OF THE INDIVIDUAL. SINCE THEY COME INTO CONFLICT, HOW WOULD AN INDIVIDUAL KNOW WHAT IS THE WILL OF THE UNKNOWN?

The question is: How can an individual know the will of the unknown? The individual is never able to know. But if the individual can let himself go, if he can erase his identity, he will know the will of the unknown immediately. Then he becomes one with the unknown. A drop cannot know what an ocean is like until it dissolves itself in the ocean. An individual can never know the will of God. As long as the individual maintains his separate identity, he can never know the unknown. But should he cease to exist as an individual separate from the divine, then only God's will remains. Because then the individual's will remains no longer. Then the question of knowing the will of the unknown does not arise -- the individual lives the way the unknown wants him to live. In this situation. the wish of the individual, his desire for any success, his longing for anything, his attitude of imposing any of his wishes upon existence remains no more, because the individual himself remains no more.

As long as the individual is conscious of himself the wish of the unknown can never be known . When the individual is no more, there remains no need to know the will of the unknown. Then whatever takes place the unknown makes happen; the individual becomes just an instrument. Throughout the Gita, Krishna counsels Arjuna precisely that he should leave himself in the hands of the unknown, that he should surrender himself to the unknown. Because those whom he thinks will die have already died through the hands of the unknown. Regarding those for whose death Arjuna feels responsible, he will not at all be responsible. Of course, if he keeps himself separate as an individual, he certainly will be responsible. But if he can let go himself and fight as an instrument, as a witness, then he will no longer be responsible.

If the individual can disappear in the universe, if he can surrender himself totally, if he can give up his ego, then the will of existence alone is fulfilled. It is being fulfilled even now; there is no way we can alter its fulfillment. But we will go on fighting, we will go on ruining ourselves, we will go on destroying ourselves in the hope of altering God's will.

I have been telling a small story about two little straws that are drifting in a flooded river. One straw, which is laying across the current and trying to hold back the flood, is screaming that he will not let the river go forward. Although the river is moving ahead and the straw is unable to control it, yet he goes on shouting that the river will be stopped. He is boasting aloud that whether he lives or dies, he will stop the river. But the straw is still drifting. Neither does the river listen to his voice, nor does she know that the straw is struggling against her. It is just a tiny little straw that the river is completely unaware of. It makes no difference to the river, but for the straw it is a matter of great consequence. His life is in great difficulty. He is drifting, and will ultimately reach the same destination whether putting up a fight or not. However this moment in between, this period in between, will be one of pain, sorrow, conflict and anxiety for him.

The straw next to this one has let go himself. He is not laying across the river, he is laying straight-facing the direction of the river -- and thinks that he is helping the river to flow. The river is completely unaware of him too. The straw thinks that since he is taking the river along with him to the ocean, she would eventually reach there. The river is totally unaware of his help also. To the river it makes no, difference, although for both straws it is a matter of great importance. The one who is taking the river along with him is in great joy, he is dancing in great delight. The one who is fighting against the river is in great pain; his dance is not a dance at all -- it is a nightmare. It is nothing but a twisting of his limbs. He is in trouble, he is getting defeated, while the one who is flowing with the river is winning.

An individual is unable to do anything except that which is the will of existence. But he has the freedom to fight, and by fighting he has the freedom to cause himself anxiety.

Sartre has made a valuable statement: "Humanity is condemned to be free." Man is compelled, he is condemned, he is cursed to be free. However, man can use his freedom in two ways. He can pit his freedom against the will of existence and create a conflict. In this case his life will be full of sorrow, pain and anguish, and ultimately he will meet defeat.

Another individual can make his freedom an object of surrender to existence; this way his life will be filled with bliss, it will be a life of dance and song. At the end there will be nothing except victory for him. The straw which realizes he is cooperative with the river is bound to be victorious. There is no way he can be defeated. The one which is blocking the river is sure to meet defeat -- there is no way he can win. So it is impossible to know the will of existence, but it is certainly possible to become one with existence. In that case, one's own will disappears and only the will of existence remains.

BELOVED OSHO,

IN SCIENTIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS THERE IS SOMETHING OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S OWN THAT IS INVESTED. IT IS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND HOW THE WILL OF EXISTENCE WORKS IN SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENT.

Normally, it seems that the individual's will works in scientific discovery -- this is what appears on the surface. It will not appear so if one looks at it deeply. You will be surprised to know that the experiences of great scientists with regard to science are quite different from the ideas created in colleges and universities.

For example, Madame Curie has written that once, for several days, she was bothered by a problem. She tried to solve it but could not. She got tired and upset, she finally gave up on it. One night at two o'clock in the morning she decided to forget about the problem, and went to bed leaving the incomplete papers on the table. When Curie woke up in the morning she found to her surprise that the half-finished problem was completed. The doors were closed and no one had come into the room. Even if someone had entered the room, it was impossible that the problem which Madame Curie could not solve, someone else could have solved. After all, the woman was a Nobel prize winner. there were only servants in the house and it would have been a miracle if any one of them had solved it.

But there was no doubt that the problem had been solved. It had been left half-done, and the remaining half was completed. She checked all the doors and still found it hard to believe. She could not accept the idea that perhaps God might have come down from above. No God had come from above anyway. When she looked more closely, she found that the rest of the handwriting was hers. Then she started recalling that during the night she had a dream. She recalled waking up in the dream itself. She dreamed that she was solving the problem, that she woke up at night and solved the problem. After that, it became a regular practice with her that whenever she was unable to solve a problem she would place it under her pillow and go to sleep. During the night she would wake up and do it.

Throughout the day, Madama Curie remained as an individual. At night in sleep the ego disappears, the drop meets the ocean. The problem that our conscious mind is not able to solve is solved by the unconscious, which deep down is united with the supreme spirit.

Once, Archimedes could not solve a problem. He was in serious trouble because the emperor had commanded him to solve it. His entire reputation depended upon solving that one problem; but he was too tired. The emperor sent messages every day asking for a solution.

Someone had presented the emperor with a very precious ornament. But the emperor suspected that he was being cheated and that something else was mixed with the gold. The problem was to find out, without destroying the ornament, whether or not some other metal was mixed in it. During those days means had not been developed to find this out. The ornament was a sizable one and its weight would have certainly increased if something else was mixed in it.

Archimedes got tired, he was troubled. One fine morning while he was laying naked in b`his bathtub, the problem was suddenly solved. He forgot everything and dashed out. For a moment he became unaware who he was; otherwise he would never have forgotten about his being naked. He came out on the street and began shouting, "Eureka! Eureka!" (I got it! I got it!) and ran toward the palace.

People took hold of him and questioned what he was doing -- "Would you appear before the emperor completely naked?" He replied, "I did not realize what I was doing!"

The man who ran out naked on the street was not Archimedes. Archimedes could never have appeared naked on the street. It must have been that at that moment he had ceased to be an individual. The problem was not solved in this individual's conscious mind; rather it was solved at a level of consciousness where the individual had ceased to exist.

He was in the bathroom lying in the tub, relaxed. A moment of meditation occurred and penetrated deep inside, and the problem was solved. the problem he could not answer himself was solved by the tub. Could the tub really have solved it? Is it ever possible to solve a problem -- by lying in water -- which one could not solve otherwise? Does intelligence increase by lying in water? That which could not be solved with clothes on, could it be solved by being naked? No, something else had happened. For a short while Archimedes ceased to be an individual. For that brief period he became one with the existence.

If we read through the experiences of all the great scientists of the world, such as Einstein, Max Planck, Eddington, Edison, we find that they shared a common experience -- whatever they came to know, in fact, they did not know. It always happens that when we really come to know something, that knowing takes place only when WE are not there. This is precisely what the sages of the UPANISHADS say, and the same is said by the sages of the VEDAS, by Mohammed and by Jesus.

When we say that the VEDAS are revealed, or not man-made, it does not mean that God appeared and wrote the book himself. There is no reason to say such ridiculous things. "Revealed" simply means that this occurrence, of putting the Vedic mantras into words, took place for the person at a moment when he himself was not present. At that very moment his "I" was not present. Thus whenever such an incident took place, when the word of an UPANISHAD was realized by someone, when the KORAN was realized by Mohammed, when the world of the BIBLE was realized by Jesus, at that moment "they" were not present.

The experiences of religion and science are not dissimilar. they can never be different, because if a truth is realized in science, its path of realization is the same as it is when one realizes the truths of religion. There is only one way of realizing the truth: when the individual is absent the truth is realized by God, who is ever present within us. An empty space occurs within us; the truth enters that empty space.

Anyone in this world -- whether a musician, a painter, a poet or a scientist, a religious person or a mystic... in this world those who have received any ray of truth, have received it only when they themselves were not present. Religion understood this long ago, and such religious experience is ten thousand years old. It is in these ten thousand years that the religious fakir, the religious saint, the religious yogi, experienced the absence of "I" -- a thing very difficult to experience.

When for the first time something appears within you which has come from God, it becomes difficult to make a distinction whether it is yours or God's.. When it appears for the first time the mind is tempted to assert its claim over it; the ego too wants to assert its claim. However, gradually, when the assertions of both become transparent and you come to know that there appears to be no link or relationship between you and the truth, then the distance between you and truth becomes apparent.

Science is still very young -- it is only two or three hundred years old, but within this time the scientist has become humble. Fifty years ago a scientist used to say, "We are the ones who discovered." He does not say this today. Now he says, "Everything seems beyond our reach." Today's scientist is speaking in the same language of mysticism as much as did the mystic in the past.

Just wait for a hundred years more and the scientist will speak exactly the same language which we find in the Upanishads. They will have to speak the very language that Buddha spoke; they will have to speak the same language that St. Augustine and St. Francis spoke. They will have to speak it, because as the experience of realizing truth becomes deeper, the experience of asserting oneself will become less and less. As the truth becomes manifest the ego dissolves, and some day it appears that whatever was known was because of God's grace. One comes to the understanding that: "It has descended upon me; I as such am not in it. And whatever I did not know, I am responsible because I was so incapable that I could not have known it."

So the presence of "I" is necessary only if un-truth is to be realized. Thus, the will of existence will never interfere in the discoveries of science. But whatever discoveries that have taken place so far are because of one's connection with the unknown, because of one's surrendering. In the future too, discoveries will take place only when one has surrendered. Except through the door of surrender, one has neither arrived at truth in the past, nor will one ever arrive in the future.

BELOVED OSHO,

THIS STATEMENT OF YOURS THAT THE UNCONSCIOUS MIND IS ALWAYS UNITED WITH GOD CREATES DIFFICULTIES. JUNG EXPLAINED THIS LATER ON BY RELATING MYTHOLOGY WITH THE "COLLECTIVE UNCONSCIOUS. BUT WHEN FREUD SAYS THAT THE UNCONSCIOUS IS ALSO CONNECTED WITH SATAN, THE PROBLEM BECOMES MORE ACUTE.

Freud does believe that our unconscious mind is not only connected with God but also with Satan. Actually "God" and "Satan" are our words. When we do not like a thing, we say that it is connected with Satan; and when we like a certain thing, we say that it is connected with God.

What I am saying is simply that the unconscious mind is connected with the unknown. And to me the unknown is God, and as far as I am concerned, Satan is included in God -- not separate from him. In fact, the mind tends to believe that what we dislike must have been done by Satan, and that which is not wrong or inconsistent must have been done by God. We have assumed ourselves as being at the center of life, and we believe that what we like is done by God -- that God is serving us. The thing we dislike is done by Satan -- that Satan is being hostile to us, It is man's ego which has engaged not only Satan but also God in its service.

There is nothing except God. What we call satanic is simply our unacceptance. What we call "bad" is merely our unacceptance. If we could see deeply into what we call bad, we would find right away that good is always hidden in it. If we could go deeply into sorrow, we would find happiness hidden in it. If we could closely watch the curse, we would find a blessing hidden in it. Actually, good and bad are just two sides of a coin. I am not referring to the unknown as God in. the sense of his being opposite to Satan; I am calling that the unknown which is at the root of our lives, which is the very basis of existence . From this source of existence emerges Ravana as well as Rama. Darkness and light both emerge from this very source.

When we are frightened in the dark, the mind tends to believe that Satan must be the creator of darkness. Since we like the light, the mind tends to believe that God must be the creator of light. But as such there is nothing wrong with darkness, nor is there anything good about light.

One who loves existence would find God as much in the darkness as he would find him in the light. The truth of the matter is that due to fear we are never able to recognize the beauty of darkness. We are never able to appreciate the flavor, the mystery of darkness. Our fear is man-made. We have emerged from the caves, we have passed through the wild -- where the darkness was dangerous, wild beasts would attack, night was frightening. That is why when fire appeared we accepted it as God -- because the night became safe. We got rid of fear by lighting a fire. So in our experience, darkness has become associated with fear. In our hearts light is associated with fearlessness. Nevertheless, the darkness has its own mystery, as the light has its own also.

Whatever significant happens in this life happens with the cooperation of darkness and light.

We sow a seed in darkness but the flower appears in the light. We sow a seed in darkness under the ground, the roots spread in the darkness under the ground, but the flowers blossom in the sky, in the light. Leave a seed in the light, the flower would never appear; bury a flower in the darkness, the seeds would never be created. A child is created in the deep darkness of the mother's womb where not a single ray of light reaches. Later, when it is developed, it appears in the light.

Thus, darkness and light are the basis for the same life-force. Division, polarity, in life are only man-made.

Freud says that the unconscious mind is joined with Satan. Freud was associated with Jewish thought. He was born in a Jewish family. Since childhood he had learned about the conflict between God and Satan. Jewish people have made a division: one belongs to Satan and the other belongs to God. Actually,

it is a division of the human mind. So Freud thought that whenever bad things surface from the unconscious, Satan must be responsible for them.

No, there is nothing like Satan. If we do come across a Satan anywhere, then we are making a fundamental mistake. A religious person is incapable of seeing a Satan. There is nothing but God around us. And the unconscious -- where the scientist finds the truth, or the religious person finds the truth -- is a door to God. As we will go deeper into this, we will understand it clearly.

HEARING SUCH WORDS OF DURYODHANA, ADDRESSED TO DRONACHARYA, THE SENIOR AMONG THE KAURAVAS, THE MOST VALIANT GRANDSIRE BHEESHMA ROARED ALOUD LIKE A LION AND BLEW HIS CONCH IN ORDER TO CHEER HIM UP.

FOLLOWING THIS, CONCHES AND KETTLE DRUMS, TAMBORS, DRUMS AND HORNS WERE STRUCK ALL TOGETHER MAKING A TUMULTUOUS NOISE.

WHILE SEATED IN THEIR MAGNIFICENT CHARIOT, WHICH WAS YOKED TO WHITE HORSES, KRISHNA AND ARJUNA ALSO BLEW THEIR CELESTIAL CONCHES.

KRISHNA BLEW HIS PANCHAJANYA CONCH AND ARJUNA HIS DEVADATTA. BHEEMA, AS THE DOER OF TERRIFIC DEEDS AND A MAN OF ENORMOUS APPETITE, BLEW HIS MIGHTY CONCH PAUNDRA.

PRINCE YUDHISHTHIRA, THE SON OF KUNTI, BLEW HIS ANANTVIJAYA CONCH, AND NAKULA AND SAHADEVA BLEW THEIR SUGHOSHA AND MANIPUSHPAKA CONCHES RESPECTIVELY.

BELOVED OSHO,

SINCE KRISHNA BLOWS HIS CONCH IN RETURN TO THE TERRIFYING SOUND OF BHEESHMA'S CONCH, COULD THE SOUNDING OF KRISHNA'S CONCH BE TAKEN AS A REACTION RATHER THAN AN INDEPENDENT ACTION? DOES THE BLOWING OF CONCHES BY KRISHNA AND ARJUNA, IN THIS CHAPTER OF THE GITA, MEAN ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE MAKING OF A PROCLAMATION?

The question has been raised: is Krishna's conch sound a reaction to Bheeshma's conch sound? No, it is simply a response. The conch sound of Krishna is merely a rejoinder though not to war or fighting. The conch sound indicates only the acceptance of challenge. No matter who gives that challenge, no matter what its implications be, no matter where that challenge might lead -- it is accepted. It would be useful to understand a little more the nature of this acceptance.

Life is a challenge every moment, and the one who does not accept it is dead even though alive. Many people die even though alive.

Bernard Shaw used to say that actually people die quite early though they are buried much later. Almost forty years pass between their death and their burial. The day a person stops accepting the challenge of life he is dead -- as of that very moment. Life is accepting challenge every moment. But this acceptance of challenge can be of two types: it can be with anger, and then it becomes a reaction; or the acceptance can be with great delight, pleasure and joy -- then it becomes a response.

It should be noted that when Bheeshma blew his conch it is said that he did so with delight, and caused rejoicing among the other warriors. With his blowing of the conch great joy spread all around. I his is acceptance -- if in life one is faced with war, the war too is accepted. If life were to lead one into a war, that war also is accepted. Naturally, this action must be responded to. So consequently, Krishna and Pandavas blow their respective conches.

It is interesting that the first conch sound comes from the side of the Kauravas. Obviously the onus of starting the war is upon the Kauravas -- Krishna is merely responding; his is a response from the side of the Pandavas. If there were to be a war then they are prepared to give a fitting reply -- though as such they have no inclination for war. The Pandavas could have been the first to blow the conch; but they didn't. The Kauravas alone are responsible for dragging everyone into the war.

The beginning of this war is very symbolic. There is another thing to notice here, that it is Krishna who takes the lead in replying to the Kauravas. Since Bheeshma has initiated a challenge from the Kaurava side, it does not seem proper that Krishna be the one to reply to him. Such a reply was proper only for those warriors who are ready for war. Krishna's presence there is only as a charioteer. he is neither a soldier, nor has he come to fight. As far as he is concerned there is no question of fighting. Thus, it is the chief of the army on the side of the Pandavas who should have replied with his conch sound.

This is very significant -- that the reply has been initiated through Krishna's conch-sound. It symbolizes that the Pandavas consider this was as nothing more than a responsibility laid upon them by God. They are ready for the call which has come from God. They are willing to fight only as instruments of God. Therefore, this rejoinder accepting war having been given through Krishna is appropriate.

It is better to meet defeat while fighting on the side of God than be victorious fighting against him. Now for the Pandavas even defeat can also be a joy, because now the fight is no longer theirs . If it is to be, it is God's. So what Krishna has done is not a reaction, it is a response. There is no anger involved in it.

If Bheema had blown the conch, it would have been a reaction. If Bheema had given the reply, it would certainly have been in anger. Since the reply has come from Krishna, it is in the form of a joyous acceptance in the sense that "All right, let us have a fight. If life has brought us to a point where eventually war is going to follow, then we leave ourselves in the hands of the supreme God."

AND THE SUPERB ARCHER -- THE KING OF KASHI, THE GREAT WARRIOR SHIKHANDI, DRISHTADUMNA AND VIRATA, AND THE INVINCIBLE SATYAKI,

KIND DRUPADA AND ALL THE FIVE SONS OF DRAUPADI, AND THE STRONG-ARMED SON SUBHADRA; O LORD OF EARTH, EACH BLEW THEIR RESPECTIVE CONCHES.

RESOUNDING HEAVEN AND EARTH, THE TUMULTUOUS UPROAR RENT THE HEARTS OF DHRITARASHIRA'S SONS.

O KING, THEN ARJUNA, WHOSE BANNER BORE THE CREST OF HANUMAN, HAVING LOOKED AT THE SONS OF DHRITARASHTRA, AND WHILE THE WEAPONS WERE JUST ABOUT TO STRIKE, PICKED UP HIS BOW AND ADDRESSED THESE WORDS TO KRISHNA:

O LORD, PLACE MY CHARIOT BETWEEN THE TWO ARMIES SO THAT I MAY SEE CLEARLY THESE MEN STANDING HERE EAGER TO FIGHT, AND FIGURE OUT WHICH ARE THOSE THAT I MUST ENCOUNTER WITH IN THIS WAR.

Arjuna is beseeching Krishna to let him see the men with whom he has to fight. There are a few remaining things which we need to understand this morning, then we will continue this evening.

Let us examine first Arjuna's request to bring him to a place from which he can see with whom he is going to fight. This indicates the fact that for Arjuna this war is really a responsibility thrust upon him from outside -- it is not a call from within. It is an obligation forced on him, it is not a desire from within. For Arjuna, this war is something he is compelled to do.

Arjuna is asking to see with whom he will be fighting, because for him the fight is inevitable. He wants to see those who have come so eagerly to participate in this war. One who is himself ready for war would not care to see whether the opponent is ready or not. One who is prepared for war is a blind man -- he never sees the enemy, he projects the enemy. He does not want to see the enemy; in fact whoever he comes across is an enemy for him. He does not have to see the enemy, he creates enemies. He projects hostility. When the battle rages within, enemies crop up outside. Only when a war does not take place within, does one have to inquire as to who is anxious and eager to have a fight. S,o Arjuna asks Krishna to place his chariot at such a point where he can see those who have assembled and are eager to fight.

Secondly, it is the first rule of war that the enemy should be clearly identified. In all wars of life -- whether taking place within or outside -- identification of the enemy is the first rule of order. Only those win wars who have distinctly identified their enemy, who can clearly recognize their enemy.

Ordinarily, one who is eager to fight is never able to win; he is already so overwhelmed with his passion for war that it becomes difficult for him to recognize the enemy. His anxiety reaches such a point that it becomes difficult to recognize who he is fighting. If we do not know who we are fighting, then defeat is certain.

If one is to be victorious in time of war, more composure is needed than at any other moment. The state of being a witness required for a victory in time of war is greater than at any other moment. Arjuna is saying, therefore, that now he would like to see as a witness those who have come to fight -- he would like to make an observation. This needs to be understood.

Observation is at a minimum when you are angry. When you are in an angry state of mind you lose entirely your ability to observe; and the fact is that the ability to observe is never needed as much as it is when you are angry. The funny thing is that when observation takes place, anger is absent; and when anger is present, observation will not take place. Both cannot be present simultaneously. If an angry person should become interested in observing, anger will disappear.

Arjuna is not angry here; that is why he is able to talk about observation. What he is saying is not out of anger. If is as if the war were just an extraneous matter for Arjuna. It is not affecting him anywhere; he simply wants to observe as a witness who is anxious to fight. This idea regarding observation is of great significance. Right observation is the first sutra for a person to follow when he goes to war -- whether to face the inner enemies or the outer.

One should have a good look at those with whom the fight is going to be. If the fight is going to be against anger, then observe anger; if it is going to be against sex, then observe sex; and if it is to be against greed, then observe greed. Even if one has to have a fight outside, first take a good look at whom the fight is going to be with. Who is he or she? A thorough observation of this kind is possible only when one has a capability of being a witness; otherwise it is impossible.

That is why the Gita is now about to begin. The stage is set. However, looking at this sutra it seems that even if nothing is known about what happens next in the Gita. one who understands the meaning of observation can very well say, merely on the basis of this sutra, that it would be very difficult for Arjuna to fight; that this man would not be able to fight, he would certainly have difficulties in fighting his enemy.

One who is interested in observation will find difficulty in fighting. He would not be able to fight if he sees; in order to fight one's eyes have to be closed. One has to go wild for fighting; there should not be any room for observation. Thus, even without further knowledge of the Gita, one who understands the principle of observation can say, in view of this sutra, that this man, Arjuna, is not dependable. This man will be of no use in war. He can easily withdraw himself from war because when he will see, he will find everything worthless. In a situation such as this, no matter who does the observation, he would find everything so futile that he would feel like getting away from it.

What Arjuna is saying is highly symbolic of his psychological state. In a way, in this sutra he is giving a very clear indication of his state of mind. He is not saying that he is anxious to fight. Neither he is saying, "O my charioteer, bring me to a place from where I can perfectly destroy my enemy." Arjuna is not saying this. What he is saying. rather, is, "Bring me to a place from where I can see who have come to fight and how eager they are to have this fight, so that I may observe them." This idea of observation itself shows that this man is of a thinking nature -- and the one who is of this nature will always be in trouble.

Only those can fight a war who are either thoughtless like Bheema or Duryodhana, or those who are "thoughtless" like Krishna.

Thought is in between these two states. Thus, there are three things; thoughtlessness, which is a state preceding thought, where war takes place easily. There is really nothing to be done in order to enter war, one who is in this psychological fame of mind is in a state of war already. Even when he loves, that love turns into a war; it ultimately turns out as hatred. Even his friendship turns out to be merely a step toward hostility. After all, in order to have an enemy one first needs to make a friend. It is difficult to create enemies without making friends. So even when a thoughtless mind makes friends, in reality it reflects nothing but hostility; hence in such a state of mind war is natural.

The second stage consists of thought. Thought always tends to be wishy-washy; it is always wavering. Arjuna is in this second stage. He is saying here, "Let me observe. Let me first understand; then I shall enter into war." No one in this world can ever enter a war while being so thoughtful.

Krishna is in the third stage. It is a stage of no-thought. Thought is absent here too, but it is not a state of thoughtlessness. Thoughtlessness and no-thought seem to be alike; however there is a fundamental difference between the two. The man of no-thought is he who, having realized the worthlessness of thought, transcends it. Actually, thought shows the futility of everything -- life, love, family, even wealth,

the world and war also. If one should go on thinking, then at the end the thought even shows the futility of thinking; and at that point a person becomes thoughtless. Then, for one achieving this state of no-thought, everything becomes as possible as it is for a thoughtless person -- only the quality changes.

When someone attains saintliness by old age, he again becomes a child. However, the similarity between saintliness and childhood exists only on the surface. A saint's eyes also appear as innocent as those of a child, but in a child everything is still dormant, it is yet to come out.

Hence, a child is only like an unexploded volcano. Its innocence is superficial; underneath, everything is ready. The seeds are still germinating, they are still sprouting. Sex, anger, hostility -- everything will surface in time. At this point everything is under preparation. A child is time-bound -- he will mark time now, and explode later.

A saint has gone beyond this. All those seeds which were supposed to have sprouted within did so, became useless, and fell down. Now nothing remains inside; now the eyes have again become innocent. Again everything has become pure.

Someone asked Jesus who would be entitled to enter his kingdom of heaven. Jesus answered, "Those who are like children." Jesus did not say those who are children; because children cannot enter. He said those who are like children, meaning not those who are children. So one thing is certain, they will be entitled to enter who are not children but who are like children.

If children were to enter heaven then there would be no problem; every child would enter. No, children would not enter; only those who are like children, who have transcended, would enter. That is why there is a great similarity between an ignorant man and a man of supreme wisdom.

The man of supreme wisdom becomes as simple as an ignorant one; however, inside the simplicity of the ignorant, complexity is still hidden which can appear at any time. The wise man is one who has lost all his complexity. One who is thoughtless can think; he will think because the power of thinking remains latent in him. One who is "thoughtless" has transcended thought, he has entered into meditation, into the state of samadhi.

This problem will arise throughout the Gita as a result of the entire phenomenon of internal conflict. Arjuna can enter into the war in two ways: either he becomes thoughtless, takes a step downward and stands where Duryodhana and Bheema are, or he rises to the point where Krishna is standing -- he becomes a man of no-thought then also he can enter into the war. However, if Arjuna remains merely as he is, in the middle, engrossed in thought, then he will head toward the forest. He cannot go to war. He will run away, escape.

Early Talks

Chapter #7

Chapter title: Osho Confronts the Followers of Maharishi Mahesh Yogi

1969 pm in Pahalgam, Kashmir, India

In 1969 followers of the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi invited Osho to talk to them. This was the first occasion on which Osho addressed a western audience, and the first time he talked publicly at length in English. The discourse has been published in OTI January 1 & 16, 1991; and February 1, 1991.

Osho: Really, there can be no method as far as meditation is concerned. Meditation is not a method. Through technique, through method, you cannot go beyond mind. When you leave all methods, all techniques, you transcend mind. So meditation itself is not a method. Truth cannot be achieved through method.

Method is our own invention. We, who are ignorant, have achieved knowledge through methods constructed, created, projected, in our ignorance. Through method you can achieve a sort of self-hypnosis, a sort of auto-hypnosis. Any method, whatsoever it's name, can only give you an illusory kind of peace. Through method you cannot go beyond yourself, because the method is yours, and it will strengthen you, your ego, your state of mind. If you leave all methods and all paths, and all ways, and remain in a total vacuum, doing nothing, thinking nothing -- only then what we call meditation can be achieved.

But if you are following some method, some path, some guru, then you are going nowhere...

(many people laugh loudly in disbelief.)

... because it cannot lead you anywhere. It can only lead you into an illusory state of auto-hypnosis.

QUESTION: SINCE THE MATERIAL ASPECT OF LIFE IS GOVERNED BY PHYSICAL APPLICATION OF THE ESSENCE OF LIFE, IT WOULD SEEM THAT WITHOUT ANY METHOD AT ALL THAT THERE WOULD BE NO RESULT SINCE WE MUST GO FROM THE PHYSICAL TO THE NON-PHYSICAL. SO MY QUESTION IS: THERE MUST BE SOME MECHANICAL PROCESS INVOLVED, THERE MUST BE, EVEN IF IT IS ONLY WORKING ON A LEVEL, YOU KNOW?

Osho: No there cannot be any mechanical process, because through any mechanical process you cannot achieve consciousness. A mechanical process itself leads to unconscious states of mind, because a mechanical process itself is unconscious. If you are thinking in terms of seeking a state of awareness it cannot be achieved through any mechanical process. A mechanical process makes you a machine, not a man. The more you become mechanical, the more technical, the more Like a machine, you lose consciousness. You can achieve some unconscious states of mind, but you cannot achieve awareness. Awareness is not an achievement through mechanical process.

And you make the distinction between the physical and the spiritual -- there is no such distinction. There is nothing like physical and nothing like spiritual. There is one thing: when it is seen it is material, when it is unseen it is spiritual. And there is no going beyond the physical because there are not two things; there is not a gap between the material and the spiritual. The whole is one.

So don't think in terms of material and spiritual. That is the old nonsense, the very old nonsense. People have made a gulf in the human mind, divided the human mind into parts -- physical, spiritual, mental. There are no such divisions.

QUESTION: YOU SAY THAT THERE IS NO TECHNIQUE TO ACHIEVE THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF BEING. THEN, ONE SHOULDN'T DO ANYTHING. RIGHT?

Osho: That is very arduous. You may think that this is the simplest thing, not to do anything. That is the most difficult thing -- not to do anything. ... Because our mind through old habits, and through old patterns, needs constant occupation.

The mind needs constant occupation. If you give it some occupation, then it is all right. You may be doing "jap" (chanting a mantra); that too is an occupation. If you don't do anything, and even for a single moment can remain without doing anything -- not even a single thought, not even doing any mantra, if you can remain for a single moment alone, not doing anything, that very moment leads through into inner depths.

QUESTION: I SEE THAT. BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IF WE ARE REALLY GOING TO LOOK AT IT AS BEING NO TECHNIQUE... I MEAN WE DO NOTHING. JUST COMING UP TO THE MOUNTAIN AND DOING ANYTHING -- LIKE MEDITATING, OR SITTING, OR ANYTHING -- IS A TECHNIQUE OF A SORT.

Osho: They are all techniques, so they are not spiritual. They are all things projected by the mind. You cannot go beyond through any ceremony, any puja. That cannot do it.

QUESTION: YOU SAY, IN OTHER WORDS, THAT A SITUATION HAS TO ARRIVE WHERE THE MIND IS BY ITSELF FOR A PERIOD OF TIME WITH NO THOUGHT OR NO MOTION. AND YET YOU SAY THERE IS NO WAY TO REALLY DO THAT, IT JUST HAPPENS. SO IF YOU ARE WORKING IN A SHOP, WHY COME TO THE MOUNTAINS, WHY SIT DOWN, WHY DO ANYTHING?

Osho: I tell you, there is no question of that. It can happen anywhere. But it can only happen in a mind which is totally unoccupied totally vacant. This is not a method rather this is an understanding of the total situation of life If you understand it, then one thing becomes clear. If you have to go somewhere else than yourself then there can be a method. there can be a path. But if you have to come to your own self, there cannot be any method. any path -- because you are not going somewhere else. Every path leads to somewhere else.

QUESTION: BUT WHAT IS THE VALUE OF THAT KNOWLEDGE? IT STRIKES ME THAT THE ONLY VALUE OF THAT KNOWLEDGE IS NOT TO UNDERTAKE ANY SPIRITUAL ACTIVITY. IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT DOES THAT GIVE YOU BEYOND IGNORANCE OF ANY SORT OF SPIRITUAL ACTIVITY WHERE YOU JUST LIVE YOUR LIFE FOR WHATEVER REASON YOU WOULD LIVE IT, AND IF YOU HAPPEN TO REACH THAT STATE AUTOMATICALLY YOU REACH IT? WHAT'S THE POINT OF KNOWING THAT? THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO KNOW.

Osho: The very awareness of the situation that surrounds you, the very mind... one has to become aware of it -- not to do something with it, but be aware of it.

QUESTION: AND THEN IT WILL HAPPEN? IF ONE IS AWARE OF THIS SITUATION THEN ONE, WITHOUT ANY FURTHER ANYTHING, WILL AUTOMATICALLY AT CERTAIN TIMES GO INTO THAT STATE -- IS THAT IT?

Osho: That is to create an opportunity. Not doing is an opportunity for the happening to come. It is not your effort that brings it; your effort cannot bring it. Any effort, whatsoever its name, cannot bring it. Your effort cannot be above you. If you are effortless, you are not doing anything, non-tense, not doing even meditation because that too is a doing -- only then you are in a state of meditation. Not doing anything, totally unoccupied, then something happens.

QUESTION: BUT IF ONE IS ALWAYS ACCUSTOMED TO ACTIVITY, ISN'T IT THEN AN EFFORT NOT TO BE ACTIVE?

Osho: We are accustomed to activity, and that is the hindrance. One has to be aware of this mechanical habit of being occupied every moment. I'm not saying that you should leave life, you should leave activity; I am simply saying that you should be aware of this very process of the mind to be engaged constantly. You should be aware of it -- then moments come. They come by themselves -- unknown, unconceived, they come by themselves -- and when they come something is revealed. That is not your doing. Something is revealed.

QUESTION: THEY WOULDN'T COME BY THEMSELVES UNLESS YOU HAD THIS INTELLECTUAL AWARENESS, THOUGH.

Osho: They come by themselves, only you have to be open. And a mind engaged is not open; a mind engaged is closed. A mind engaged has no windows.

QUESTION: BUT AREN'T YOU USING YOUR INTELLECT TO BE OPEN? I THINK TO MYSELF, I WILL BE OPEN, AND THAT IS AN EFFORT OF SOME SORT. IN OTHER WORDS, IF ONE IS TRULY OPEN WITHOUT EFFORT, THEN IT PROBABLY WOULDN'T OCCUR TO ONESELF TO BE OPEN.

Osho: You cannot be open through effort. If you are thinking this, then you have not understood it. Thinking means non-understanding. The person who thinks is a man of non-understanding. A person who knows doesn't think. (much laughter) It is not a question of thinking. He sees, he is aware, but not in thinking. Thoughts are not opening, thoughts are closing; they close your mind. The more you are in a thinking mood, the more you are closed and isolated from the whole. If you are not thinking, if you just are, if you are in a state of being, then something comes. That is not thinking, that is the realization. That is not thinking, you have not thought it. And the more you have thought about it, the less is the possibility for its coming. The known must go for the unknown to come. The thinking must go for the truth to be revealed.

One is to be aware of the mechanism of the mind, how the mind works, how the mind needs constantly occupation. Every moment mind needs to be occupied. It has become a mechanical tendency -- you need occupation, you need occupation. Once you leave the so-called worldly occupations you become occupied in spiritual affairs, but you remain occupied. One is to be aware of this very process of the mind. That awareness of the mechanical process stops the process. Moments come -- they break through -- and you see something. That is not your thinking, not a by-product of your thought.

QUESTION: ISN'T IT POSSIBLE TO USE THAT TENDENCY OF THE MIND, THAT ENGAGEMENT OF THE MIND TO GOOD PURPOSE?

Osho: No, there is no question of good purpose or bad purpose. Mind constantly deludes you.

QUESTION: MAYBE WE CAN GIVE IT SOMETHING VERY ENGAGING, SO BEAUTIFUL THAT IT WILL ENGAGE THE MIND TO SOMETHING THAT IS THE MOST BEAUTIFUL OF ALL.

Osho: It may be beautiful, it may be good, but an occupied mind cannot transcend itself.

QUESTION: BUT IF THERE IS SOMETHING MORE BEAUTIFUL THAN WHAT THE MIND IS OCCUPIED WITH, THEN IT WILL THROW OFF WHAT IT IS NOT....

Osho: Your mind or my mind cannot conceive something beyond it. The beauty must be below the mind. If something beyond is to be conceived, the mind must cease to be.

QUESTION: YES. BUT WHAT I AM SAYING IS, YOU TALK OF HOW THE MIND CONSTANTLY IS ENGAGED. NOW I AM SAYING THAT ISN'T IT POSSIBLE THAT WE CAN GIVE THE MIND....

Osho: Who can give? The mind gives itself....

QUESTION: ... A THOUGHT THAT IS SO BEAUTIFUL TO THE MIND THAT....

Osho: You are giving it!

QUESTION: NO, NO, I'M NOT.

Osho: And you are thinking it is so beautiful.

QUESTION: NO, NO, NO.

Osho: That is your mind giving it.

QUESTION: NO, I AM NOT THINKING IT IS SO BEAUTIFUL. THE MIND LIKES ENJOYMENT, YES?

Osho: Yes.

QUESTION: FINE. NOW, IF THE MIND LIKES ENJOYMENT, IT WILL NATURALLY BE ENJOYED WITH THOUGHTS. NOW IS IT POSSIBLE THAT THERE IS ONE THOUGHT THAT CAN BE IN THE MIND THAT IS SO BEAUTIFUL IT WILL KEEP THE MIND ENTERTAINED UNTIL IT FINDS SOMETHING THAT IS ULTIMATE BEAUTY -- NAMELY BLISS, THE SELF? IS THAT POSSIBLE?

Osho: It is not possible. (Laughter)

QUESTION: WHY?

Osho: It is not possible because mind likes enjoyment, that is right. Why does it like enjoyment? -- to forget itself. It likes enjoyment to be occupied, to be engaged, to forget oneself. A mind which is constantly trying to forget oneself is a mind which is constantly seeking some type of hypnosis, some type of unconsciousness. A mind which dreams or which is engaged in puja, in ceremony, in bhajan, in prayer, is a mind which is constantly escaping from oneself. and the mind which is escaping from oneself cannot know oneself; because to know oneself one has to cut this constant escapement. A thing may be beautiful; you may project beauty on it -- but you are projecting it. There is nothing like beauty or ugliness; that division is made by our own projections. There is nothing beautiful, there is nothing ugly. Things are, they exist in themselves. Without our projections they are, simply they are. There is nothing beautiful, nothing ugly. But you can project, and escape from yourself. And we are always thinking how to escape from ourselves. It has become so burden-some to be oneself, it has become so ugly, it has become so tense to be oneself. We are -- in love, in beauty, in films, in wine, in meditation even -- we are escaping from ourselves.

That is to be understood: why are you escaping from yourself? And you cannot come to you through any escape from you.

The active must cease. The constant seeking for pleasure, for enjoyment, must cease to be oneself, to know oneself, to know who you are.

QUESTION: WHAT BECOMES OF THE DESIRE? LET'S SAY YOU ESCAPE ALL WORLDLY PLEASURES? NOW HOW DO YOU ACCOUNT FOR THE DESIRE THAT REMAINS AFTER YOU CUT WHATEVER IT IS YOU CUT?

Osho: Something new happens. The desire is gone, the very seeking for the enjoyment is gone. Then really comes the divine enjoyment, the bliss you are seeking. It cannot come -- it is not possible -- through your occupation. It comes only in an unoccupied mind, in an aware mind -- unoccupied, totally unoccupied. It comes -- the bliss comes, God comes, the divine comes. It comes, not through your escape from yourself, but through your coming to yourself. How can you come when you are engaged in enjoyment?

QUESTION: IF REALIZATION, IF THE ULTIMATE BEAUTY OR KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, OF BLISS, OF REALITY, LIES IN THE SELF, WHY ARE WE CONSTANTLY TRYING TO ESCAPE FROM THE SELF? IT WOULD SEEM TO ME IF THAT'S WHERE IT ALL LIES, WHAT A CRUEL TRICK FOR NATURE TO PLAY ON US. WE RUN AWAY FROM WHAT WE ARE MOST LOOKING FOR -- IT SEEMS ILLOGICAL.

Osho: The bliss lies within oneself, but that you have gained from some scripture; you don't know it. You don't know there is bliss in oneself, there is God in oneself. If you know it, then there is no question. If you don't know it, and this has become a borrowed part of your knowledge, then the question comes.

The question is created by the borrowed knowledge, not by one's own mind. You have not known the self; neither have you known the bliss; neither have you known God. If you have known it, then there is no question.

QUESTION: DO YOU KNOW ALL AT ONCE, OR COULD ONE FEEL THE BLISS OF THE SELF BEFORE CONFRONTING GOD?

Osho: No, there is no question of God! The very bliss is God.

QUESTION: YOU SAID EARLIER THAT THE MIND COMES INTO A VACUUM, IF I UNDERSTOOD CORRECTLY. IF THE NATURE OF THE MIND IS TO THINK, THEN TO PUT THE MIND INTO A VACUUM WOULD BE GOING AGAINST THE NATURE OF THE MIND.

Osho: No! That will be going certainly against the nature that we have known. There is no question of going against the nature. Against the habit, yes. The nature is much more comprehensive.

QUESTION: WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE MIND?

Osho: To think is the nature of the mind. And if you don't think then there is no mind. A state of no-mind comes, then you know. That is nature, this too is nature; that is not against this nature which creates ignorance, creates unknowing, creates conflict. We have not known the total mind, we have known only the mind which thinks. If you transcend it then you know the total mind -- which knows.

Thinking is one thing, knowing is quite another.

QUESTION: THE NATURE OF THE MIND IS TO THINK, AND THEN IT CEASES TO THINK. WHAT DO YOU DO IN ORDER TO CAUSE IT NOT TO THINK? DOES IT NATURALLY NOT THINK?

Osho: If you become aware of your thinking process, then the process by and by is dissolved. If you become aware, if you become aware of your thoughts, the passing, the going, the coming in and the going out of the thought -- if you become simply aware, a witness then the process stops by itself.

QUESTION: IT BECOMES MORE SUBTLE UNTIL IT STOPS....

Osho: It stops. And then there is no mind. Then you are.

QUESTION: THAT'S A TECHNIQUE, WHICH YOU'VE BEEN DISCOURAGING.

Osho: You can call it a technique, but when you call it a technique you have not understood... Because awareness is not a technique. (laughter) Awareness is not a technique. (laughter)

Knowledge does not come in steps, in degrees; only ignorance goes in steps and degrees. Knowledge comes in an explosion. that is not a process. The coming of the knowledge is not a process, the going of the ignorance is certainly a process, because when your mind is, by and by, awakening, becoming conscious of the thought process, thoughts become less and less. The process gains gaps, intervals. But this is not the coming of the knowledge, this is simply mind going in slow process. The mind is going, the mind is continuing. When the mind completely goes off, then the knowledge comes. It comes as an explosion, not in steps.

Question: It's like a fuse on a piece of dynamite; the fuse burns a little bit at a time, right? And when it reaches the dynamite, then it explodes. But the path to the explosion nevertheless is a scientific process. It can be predicted, it can be measured and it can be taught to other people no?

Osho: No, it cannot scientific.

Question: Not the result, the approach to the result.

Osho: Not even the process can be. The process cannot be scientific, cannot be known as a technique, because when you make it a technique, then everybody can follow it mechanically. The technique can be followed mechanically, and when it is followed mechanically you cannot become aware through it.

QUESTION: IF YOU TAKE THE SAME FUSE AND YOU LIGHT IT WITH YOUR EYES CLOSED OR YOU LIGHT IT WITH YOUR EYES OPEN, THE DYNAMITE'S STILL GOING TO EXPLODE.

Osho: It can explode, because the outer knowledge can be made a methodology, a technique, and it can be followed unknowingly. A mechanic who doesn't know the process simply switches off or switches on and the explosion can go. But spiritual knowledge, the knowing of oneself, the gaining of bliss,

cannot be like this. If it can be like this then you are simply creating through a process, through a technique, an illusory state of mind that can be created.

QUESTION. HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT?

Osho: You can know it.

QUESTION: IN THE BIBLE THERE'S A VERY SHORT SENTENCE AND IT SAYS, "BE STILL AND KNOW."

Osho: That is quite right!

QUESTION: "BE STILL AND KNOW THAT I AM GOD."

Osho: That is right.

QUESTION: YOU HAVE DEFINED MIND FOR US, I WOULD ASK YOU TO DEFINE AWARENESS. SOMEONE ELSE USED THE PHRASE "INTELLECTUAL AWARENESS" AND YOU DIDN'T TEST HIM ON THAT. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO DEFINE AWARENESS.

Osho: There cannot be any intellectual awareness. Awareness is always total. It cannot be divided as intellectual, as emotional....

Question: Do you agree with that sentence then that says, "Be still and know"?

Osho: That sentence is beautiful. Be still means don't make yourself still. Be still means be still. Don't make any effort to be still, just be still. And if you are doing something to be still, then the stillness will simply be a created, cultivated stillness not the real.

Question: "Be still and know.... "

Osho: Then you know ultimately -- there is no sense in prolonging the sentence -- be still, and you know. There is no question of knowing. It comes by itself. Just be still....

QUESTION: EVERY MAN SPEAKS FROM HIS OWN EXPERIENCE, HIS OWN LEVEL, RIGHT? ISN'T IT POSSIBLE THAT THERE MIGHT BE A TECHNIQUE THAT WOULD WORK THAT PERHAPS YOU HAVEN'T EXPERIENCED.

Osho: No, it is not possible (laughter) because you are thinking always how to get a technique; that is, how to make it easy, how to make it simple, how to make it a market product -- how to make it. But the awakening is so individual, it is so authentically individual, it is so uniquely individual, it cannot be made a mass technique.

Question: But everyone thinks....

Osho: Everyone thinks.

Question: Everyone wants pleasure from thinking.

Osho: Yes.

Question: So maybe there is something there that can be used for everyone. The individual knowing -- that's individual. But is it not possible that since everyone's mind wants to think, wants to enjoy, it's possible to somehow do something with that?

Osho: Yes, everyone wants to enjoy, everyone wants peace, bliss, but then everyone wants to create some technique to achieve it. But the mind asking for enjoyment and the mind asking for technique is the mind of a person who is not ready to be aware. He wants to remain in his sleep and to cling to a technique. The sleep remains there, and he clings to a technique. The technique too will become a part of the sleep and will not disturb it, But will make it more convenient, more comfortable, and he will be more at ease in his sleep. The very need, the very asking for a mass technique is saying that I am not going towards the goal individually.

Question: Why?

Osho: I am asking others to be with me.

Question: How long does it take to....

Osho: There is no question of how long.

Question: If you had proof that this technique did work. if you would try the technique -- like flipping a light switch on -- and you recognized the fact that this switch... this condition, that would bring the mind to this absolute....

Osho: No! I understand you. She is saying that if someone says this technique, this method, this way has become for me the achievement, then you can follow it. But when you follow, then you are misguided forever. The very following is misguidance, the very following... because the following is mechanical, the following can be without any awareness. When you follow someone you follow blindly; the very following is blindness. It cannot give you awareness. When you are not following anybody, you just become aware of the very process of life, or the very process of the mind, the very entanglement, the conflict, the anxiety, then you become aware of this whole life, this totality. Something comes to you, not from following somebody else, not from going in the steps of others but in your own search. The search is so authentically individual you cannot follow anybody.

Question: Each one finds this for himself only by being given the keys....

Osho: There is no key. If there can be any key, then it can be produced and everybody can be given it.

QUESTION: DON'T BELIEVE IT! THIS IS SO SCIENTIFIC, DO NOT HAVE FAITH IN IT AND DON'T BELIEVE IT. JUST TRY IT. THAT'S ALL WE ASK. AND WHEN ONE STARTS TO RECOGNIZE THE EXPANSION OF MIND. THIS GREATER ENERGY, THE GREATER ENERGY FOR ALL THINGS IN LIFE...

Osho: You can try it and you can even experience what has been propagated. You can even experience it, because experiences are not spiritual. The very experiencing can be created through a technique. But those experiences are created through the technique, and you will think that the technique is right because the experience has come. But the experience which has come through a technique is not the explosion; it's simply a false coin. It is not the real stillness.

QUESTION: IT SEEMS THAT THERE MIGHT BE A SLIGHT CONFUSION ABOUT THE WORD 'TECHNIQUE ' HERE. WHAT WE'RE SPEAKING ABOUT IN TERMS OF THE WORD 'TECHNIQUE' IS NOT A PROCESS WHERE THE MIND IS HELD UP AT EACH LEVEL. OR ACTUALLY ENGAGES IN SOME THOUGHT THROUGH AN INTELLECTUAL PROCESS WHEREBY THERE IS AN EXPERIENCER AND AN OBJECT OF EXPERIENCE.

Osho: No!

QUESTION: WHAT WE'RE SPEAKING ABOUT IS A TECHNIQUE WHEREBY THROUGH NO EFFORT AT ALL, THROUGH A SITUATION WHICH IS ENTIRELY INnocent, which is in each person, the object of experience becomes subtler, subtler, subtle until the object of experience is transcended, and we're in a state of pure experience -- alone. The self is left alone with the self. Not through any technique as such, but through a very innocent, effortless, natural flow of the mind to this state.

Osho: If you begin with an object you cannot transcend the object. The very first step will be the last step. Don't begin with the object. If you begin with the object the knowledge will remain objective; it will not transcend the object. The more subtle you go, the object may become more subtle, but you don't transcend it.

QUESTION: NO, BUT WE DO! (LOTS OF LAUGHTER)

Osho: You can be in illusion. (More laughter) And no one who is in illusion, no one who is in a dream, no one who is under hypnosis, will say, "I am under hypnosis, I am in illusion."

What I am saying is that mind can be made still. Mind can be brought to a state of stillness through method. But through method, when the mind comes to stillness, that stillness is nothing but self-hypnosis. Through method, only, you can hypnotize; you cannot achieve. You can only achieve when the mind has not done anything. If the mind has done anything, then the creation is of the mind. If the mind has not done anything, only then.... If you are feeling, and thinking that you are feeling something, and you stop the process, then the feeling will go.

I am saying that if you leave the technique, if you stop your meditations, this feeling will go. The feeling will continue only if you continue the process.

QUESTION: NOT SO! IF YOU WILL EXCUSE ME SAYING SO, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, CHRIST SAYS, "BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM. WHEN WE COME OUT OF MEDITATION, THE THINGS WHICH WE HAVE BEEN FEELING AND DOING WHICH ARE NEGATIVE JUST DON'T HAPPEN. WE ARE MUCH HAPPIER OUT OF MEDITATION.

Osho: You can be happier through LSD too.

QUESTION: WE ARE NOT HERE TO TEACH YOU THE WAY OF TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION, BUT TO HEAR FROM YOU YOUR PATH. AND I THINK IT'S BETTER NOW TO PERHAPS START WITH YOU TELLING US SOMETHING OF YOUR PATH.

WELL, WHAT I'D LIKE TO KNOW IS, WHEN YOU REALIZE YOUR STILLNESS YOU SAY THAT KNOWLEDGE COMES ALL AT ONCE. WELL, I IMAGINE IT WOULD, TAKE A WHILE UNTIL THIS WOULD COME, RIGHT? BUT THEN AFTER THIS HAS COME, ARE YOU LIKE AN ENLIGHTENED MAN FOREVER, OR DO YOU HAVE TO REPEAT THIS PATH?

Osho: No, you have not to repeat

QUESTION: YOU ONLY HAVE TO DO IT ONCE AND THEN WHEN YOU STOP DOING IT.... BUT WHAT IF YOU LIVE IN THE WORLD? HOW ARE YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF THE WORLD AND YOUR ACTIONS IN THE WORLD CHANGED?

Osho: They change totally. You are quite a different person -- not even a person, because the person too was a part of your old mind; that too has gone. Not even are you an individual now -- the individual has gone; you have become part and parcel of the whole. There is no ego, no doer; you become simply a part of the divine process, of the divine life.

When it comes, it comes and never goes. And if it is achieved through any process, it comes and it goes, because it has not come, really; it has been part of the feeling created by the process. When the process stops, it goes. It will go by and by, but it will go. and you will have to repeat the process constantly.

When the explosion comes, then it has come. In the explosion, it is not that you have achieved bliss, because in the explosion you have gone. Only the bliss is there... not even you, not even the experiencer. When you go through a technique the experiencer remains, the ego remains, and the ego says, "I have experienced, I am experiencing." If the experiencer is there, then you have not come to the explosion, because the very explosion is the explosion of the experiencer. That experiencer is gone. There is now no experience, no experiencer, no object, no subject. There is only experience. Not even the experiencer is there.

QUESTION: THIS STATE OF EXPLOSION, IS THERE A CORRESPONDING STATE OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM? WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE PHYSICAL NERVOUS SYSTEM THAT CORRESPONDS TO THE STATE YOU ARE SPEAKING OF?

Osho: This body is not there, but the whole body of the cosmos is there. Your body has gone -- not as body itself but "your," the "your" has gone. The body is there but it has become a part of the whole cosmic body. It is not your body now, not your nervous system now.

QUESTION. IS IT A DREAMING OR A WAKING OR A DEEP SLEEP?... IS THERE BREATHING? IF A PERSON LOOKED AT THAT BODY, WOULD HE DESCRIBE IT AS BEING DIFFERENT THAN BEFORE IT EXPLODED?

Osho: There is breathing, there is not sleep, there is not unconsciousness. But he breathing will become subtly different; it will be different from our normal breathing, because....

QUESTION: YOU SEE, WHAT I AM TRYING TO ESTABLISH IS THAT IN TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION THIS STATE OF NOT IN ILLUSION CORRESPONDS TO A PHYSICAL STATE OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM THAT POSSIBLY IS THE SAME TO WHICH YOU ARE REFERRING, AND THAT IS THE STATE OF WHAT IS CALLED RESTFUL ALERTNESS. WHERE THERE IS NO BREATH AND THE METABOLIC RATE IS LOWERED TO NIL. BUT THE POINT IS: IS THERE A STATE OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM THAT ONE CAN LOOK AT AND OBSERVE...?

Osho: Yes, you can look and observe, but don't think that a state cannot be illusory because there is a corresponding change in the nervous system. Even in illusion, the corresponding change can exist -- even in illusion, because in a dream, in a nightmare, you awake; you feel that the whole body has been trembling. Even in the nightmare the body has gone through a change, the body has been affected. There has been a parallel change in the nervous system.

Because there is a change in the nervous system, you cannot say that a state is not illusory. There will be a change; there will be a change in the whole system because when the mind has gone, a transformation, a mutation, has taken place.

QUESTION: IT'S OBVIOUS BY NOW THAT WE CAN'T ARRIVE AT A CONCLUSION USING WORDS, SO THEREFORE, IF YOU CALL MY EXPERIENCE AN ILLUSION....

Osho: No, no, I am not calling your experience illusion. I am calling a particular experience achieved through a technique an illusion. I'm not calling your experience illusion -- don't take it that way.

QUESTION: IS IT ILLUSION OR THE END OF ILLUSION?

Osho: The means create the end, so if you use illusory means you create an illusory end.

QUESTION: MY END IS NOT AN ILLUSION; YOU CAN'T CALL MY END OF ABSOLUTE BEING MY ILLUSION.

Osho: No, no, I am not calling your end an illusion. (The group laughs) If you are achieving some states of mind through techniques then through techniques only illusion can be created.

QUESTION: BUT IN YOUR STATE OF ENLIGHTENMENT, ARE YOU A WITNESS TO EVERYTHING AROUND YOU?

Osho: No, not even a witness. Even the witness has gone. You are not even a witness.

QUESTION: YOU'RE NOT A WITNESS ANY MORE?

Osho: You are one with it -- not even a witness.

QUESTION: ARE THERE THOUGHTS TOO?

Osho: No, there are no thoughts then.

QUESTION: YOU DO NOT HAVE THOUGHTS?

Osho: There are no thoughts then.

QUESTION: I SEE, I SEE.

Osho: When I am talking to you, I am using thoughts as means.

QUESTION: YES, THAT'S WHAT I MEAN. WHAT IS YOUR RELATIONSHIP TO THOSE THOUGHTS?

Osho: As a means of expression, not as a means of achievement.

QUESTION: ARE YOU THE THOUGHT, OR DO YOU WATCH THE THOUGHT?

Osho: No, there is no thought, so there is no question of watching the thought.

QUESTION: I THOUGHT YOU SAID YOU JUST USE THOUGHTS AS A VEHICLE, AS A MEANS OF EXPRESSION.

Osho: Of course.

QUESTION: SO THERE ARE THOUGHTS. ALL RIGHT. NOW, WHAT IS YOUR RELATIONSHIP TO THE THOUGHTS?

Osho: No, there is no question of relationship. The relationship comes if there are two -- then the question of relationship comes. If there is only one, there is no question of relationship.

QUESTION: THEN YOU ARE YOUR THOUGHTS .

Osho: No, there is no question of you and your thoughts.

QUESTION: THERE'S JUST ONE.

Osho: Just one. There is no question of relationship.

QUESTION: LET ME GO BACK A LITTLE WHILE HERE. YOU SAID BEFORE THAT YOU COULD NOT EXPERIENCE THIS. BUT HOW COULD YOU TALK ABOUT EXPLOSION WITHOUT EXPERIENCING IT?

Osho: One can talk about all explosion, not what comes out of it. The explosion can be talked about but what comes after it cannot be talked about. That is impossible to say.

QUESTION: WITHOUT KNOWING THE EXPLOSION, COULD ONE TALK ABOUT IT?

Osho: No. How can you talk without knowing it? But when you talk, something different comes out of the words, something quite different; rather, quite opposite to what you have experienced. This going out of existence, going out of existence of the experiencer, it comes after the explosion.

QUESTION: IT COMES IN DEGREES?

Osho: No, how can explosion come in degrees?

QUESTION: I WANT TO MAKE SURE I UNDERSTAND: IN YOUR PHILOSOPHY IS THE MIND AND THE SELF THE SAME?

Osho: If the mind is without thoughts, it is the same.

QUESTION: THE MIND AND THE SELF ARE THEN THE SAME?

Osho: The same -- if there are no thoughts. But if there are thoughts then the barrier between the self and the mind is created. The thought is the barrier.

QUESTION: WHAT HAPPENS TO THE SELF WHEN THE MIND CEASES?

Osho: It is! It is simply... It is the very isness, the very being. When we ask "What happens?" then we are again thinking of becoming. What happens? -- no!

QUESTION: THE MIND IS A PHYSICAL THING, IS IT NOT?

Osho: The brain is a physical thing, not the mind.

QUESTION: YOU ARE MAKING A DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE BRAIN AND THE MIND?

Osho: A distinction to be discussed; there is no distinction in the reality.

QUESTION: I JUST WANT TO MAKE AN OBSERVATION. I THINK IT IS VERY OBVIOUS TO ME -- I DON'T KNOW IF IT IS OBVIOUS TO MANY PEOPLE -- THAT IN THIS SITUATION WITH THE PERSON WE ARE COMMUNICATING WITH.... HE HASN'T EVEN GIVEN HIS POSITION, SO WE HAVE DONE A REVERSE TECHNIQUE... TO DEFEND OUR POSITION. REMEMBER WHAT SHAKESPEARE SAID: "THOU DOTH PROTEST TOO MUCH." IT IS AN INDICATION TO ME OF A LOT OF INSECURITY THAT WE ALL HAVE ABOUT OUR POSITION. WHY DON'T WE LET OUR LEARNED GENTLEMAN -- WHO I BASICALLY AGREE WITH EVERYTHING HE SAYS ON AN INTELLECTUAL LEVEL -- STATE HIS POSITION, AND WHAT HIS MOVEMENT IS ABOUT, BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT WE WANT TO LEARN ABOUT. (CLAPPING)

Osho: There is nothing like my position, because to posit a position, to conceive a position, is to be untrue. I have got no position. You may have got your position, so you can be opposed to me, but I have no position of my own. I am totally negative.

I am negative, I am not a positive mind. I am totally negative. I will negate what you say, but I won't say anything as my position, because to me a positive mind cannot become a vacuum, cannot become vacant, cannot be a nonentity. A positive mind can never be; only a negative mind. A mind which comes through thinking to be negative, negates everything. When you negate everything then the mind becomes a vacuum. This is my position.

(Laughter)

QUESTION: CAN YOU TELL US HOW YOU MANAGE TO GET AN UNOCCUPIED MIND -- BECAUSE THAT IS THE FIRST STEP FOR YOUR EXPERIENCE, YES?

Osho: I try to understand the occupied mind. My own mind, occupied constantly -- I observed it. The very observation of the occupied mind makes the mind unoccupied. If you go deep and deep and observe it, simply observe it, don't do anything -- the moment you do something the observation has gone. Even if you criticize it, even if you say it is bad or good, even if you appreciate it or condemn it, then the observation has gone. If you simply observe it, then through the observation the unoccupied mind comes, the occupied mind goes. Simple observation.

QUESTION: CAN A VACANT, AN UNOCCUPIED MIND BE A DYNAMIC, A CREATIVE MIND?

Osho: Of course. Only an awakened mind can be creative -- only.

QUESTION: AWAKENED, BUT I SAID VACANT AND UNOCCUPIED.

Osho: Aha! A vacant and unoccupied mind becomes awakened, and an awakened mind is a dynamic and creative mind. Only an awakened mind is a dynamic and creative mind.

QUESTION: SO IN THE STATE OF ENLIGHTENMENT IT IS NO LONGER VACANT AND UNOCCUPIED, IT IS OCCUPIED?

Osho: No! It is not occupied, it is creative. But to be creative and to be occupied are two different things.

QUESTION: WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY CREATIVE?

Osho: To be creative means constantly, moment to moment, living as a creative force -- as a creative force, not as an occupied doer, not as a doer. There is no doer so there is no occupation, but the creation goes on. The very creation of the world, the very creation of the cosmos goes on. Not that there is an engineer, a God who is thinking about it, a painter -- not thinking about it. There is no thinking.

QUESTION: WATCHING IT?

QUESTION: WHAT ABOUT THE PROCESS OF OBSERVATION?

Osho: Only an authentic painter is really not different from his painting. The painter and the painting are one. There is no actor, there is no ego, and there is no occupation, because when there is no ego who can be occupied?

QUESTION: BY EXPLAINING THIS PROCESS, YOU ONLY EXPLAINED TO US WHAT WE SHOULD NOT DO, BUT WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT TO DO.

Osho: No, I won't say, because that is the wrong... that is the pseudo path. If someone says, "Do this," then he creates a positive mind, and the positive mind is a filled mind, an occupied mind -- not vacant, not receptive, not open. So I won't say what to do, I will say what not to do.

QUESTION: THAT'S A FULLNESS TOO. YOU ARE FILLING THE MIND WITH NEGATIVE THINGS, NOT TO DO THIS, NOT TO DO THAT. THAT'S HORRIBLE! (MANY COMMENTS ALL AT ONCE, AND A VOICE: "OH, COME ON, WE'RE STARTING TO ARGUE AGAIN!")

Osho: Hmmm?

QUESTION: I HAVE A QUESTION, SIR. BEFORE WE TRY TO START YOU ON TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION, I THINK YOU SAID SOMETHING ABOUT "FREEDOM FROM THE KNOWN." STRANGELY, COINCIDENTALLY, THIS IS A TITLE OF A BOOK BY KRISHNAMURTI. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK IF HE IS IN ACCORD WITH YOU, AND MORE POINTEDLY, IS THERE SOMETHING I CAN DO TO LIBERATE MYSELF?

Osho: No, you cannot understand through any comparison. There is a book by Krishnamurti, Freedom from the Known, but if you want to understand me, understand me; why bring Krishnamurti between us? There is no sense....

QUESTION: BUT IS THERE ANYTHING I CAN DO TO LIBERATE MYSELF FROM IT ALL? IS THERE SOMETHING THAT I CAN DO -- MUST I SIMPLY SIT AND WAIT AND HOPE, OR CAN I ACT?

Osho: You think that simply sitting is something simple? (laughter) It is the most difficult thing! If you can simply sit then everything will come to you; then there is no question.

COMMENTS: THAT'S AGAIN PROCESS ....

Osho: In the word, in the expression -- because our whole language, our whole terminology is based on process, technique, method. So in words you cannot express a thing which has not been experienced -- in words, in thoughts. So when I say it, it looks like a process, but it is not a process.

QUESTION: WHAT IS IT?

Osho: It is the very stopping of the process.

QUESTION: AGAIN THE PROCESS....

Osho: The word -- the word carries the meaning of the process.

QUESTION: BECAUSE STOPPING SOMETHING MEANS, I THOUGHT....

Osho: Of course, in language. That is what you are saying. That's what you are understanding. In language you cannot say anything which is not a doing, not a process. So it has to be understood.

QUESTION: AGAIN A PROCESS?

Osho: Of course, I am saying that. Every word is a process, every word! Every word is a process. But there are things which are not a process. If you can understand, then it is alright. If you don't understand, then too it is all right!

QUESTION: WHAT YOU ARE SAYING AND WHAT YOU ARE TEACHING CANNOT BE THOUGHT, BECAUSE....

Osho: It cannot be thought.

QUESTION: HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE TO LEARN THE TECHNIQUE OF NOT USING A TECHNIQUE?
(Laughter)

Osho: If you can understand, then this very moment is the moment.

If you don't understand, there is no question of the length. It can be for lives. If you understand, you understand in this very moment, NOW!

QUESTION: BUT IS UNDERSTANDING THE SAME AS BEING?

Osho: Of course, it is the same.

QUESTION: I THINK WE ARE SAYING THE SAME THING. IT'S JUST A MATTER OF VOCABULARY AND SEMANTICS. WHY SHOULD WE MAKE AN ISSUE OUT OF IT WHEN BASICALLY WE AGREE?

(Comments all together)

QUESTION: EXCEPT, EXCEPT ....

QUESTION: WE MAKE IT SIMPLE, YOU MAKE IT DIFFICULT!

Osho: About truth, only the negative statement can be made. You can only be consistent with the untrue, because the truth is so vast. It comprehends the contradictions. So about truth, whenever someone speaks he is bound to make contradictions, and if someone is constantly consistent, not making any contradictions, he is not concerned with the truth. He is concerned with a hypothesis. A man-made hypothesis can be consistent, but the real -- that which is -- is always contradictory. There is darkness and light, both, it comprehends both, it comprehends the birth and the death. Life is both, birth and death. It is not contradictory in life, but to us it seems contradictory -- two things quite opposite. Another thing: Maharishi says there is a path from the here to there. But there can be no path from the here to the here. There is the illusion. The point there is the illusion. The question is coming from the here to the here, and until and unless the there is dissolved you cannot come from the here to the here. The there is the disturbance. You are always going to the there and always going there, going there, going there -- in richness, in meditation, in religion, in science, going there. That is the question.

The mind which goes there cannot be here. (Laughter) A mind which leaves going there can be here -- just this moment can be here. The very going to there is the hindrance, so there can be no path. Only one has to be aware of this constant trick of the mind of going there, going there -- this very business.

This there is the illusion, this is the very point of illusion. It may be anything -- it may be a god, a liberation, a moksha -- but mind always longs for there, and that has been the disturbance, that has been the misguiding of the mind. One is to be here.

So the question is not going in the hotel; the question is going somewhere where you are already.

So there can be no path, there is no possibility of there being any path. A path can join two points -- here and there, present and future. A path can join two different points, but you are and there is no question of there, you are here -- always here. You have been here always. And unless and until the there is dissolved you cannot know what here is. So there is no possibility of there being any technique.

And one thing more Maharishi says: If you sit still the mind will become dull. If you do something, the mind by the very doing becomes dull. If you don't do anything, the mind is completely fresh, total; how can it be dull? The very achieving mind, the mind which longs for achievement, the mind which seeks achievement, the mind which is after achievement, is the hindrance. This longing to achieve is the hindrance. So God cannot be made an achievement. The enlightenment cannot be made an achievement. You cannot make it an achievement. It is the non-achieving mind which achieves.

And one thing more Maharishi says: If you sit still the mind will become dull. If you do something, the mind by the very doing becomes dull. If you don't do anything, the mind is completely fresh, total; how can it be dull? It cannot be dull. Mind can be made dull through any process. The very process makes the mind dull because the process is a repetition. The repetition is yet dullness. Whenever you repeat

something you become dull. You go on repeating, go on repeating, repeating, repeating, you become a dullness.

QUESTION: DOES IT DEPEND ON WHAT LEVEL THE MIND IS ON?

Osho: There is no such thing as level. There is no question of level. Maharishi says there are deeper realms, there are ..... There is only Being. There is no question of level. There is only a total Being.

MAHARISHI MAHESH YOGI: IT IS NECESSARY TO BE HERE. IT IS NECESSARY TO BE HERE ONLY IF WE ARE THERE. IF WE ARE HERE THEN IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO BE HERE. WE HAVE GONE THERE, AND IF WE HAVE GONE THERE, IN ILLUSION WE ARE HERE. NOW ENLIGHTENMENT WILL BE THAT WE COME BACK HERE. SO THERE IS HERE. IF WE HAVE TO COME BACK, THEN WE HAVE TO COME BACK. THAT MEANS IT'S A PROCEDURE WHETHER WE COME BACK IN A CAR OR IN A JET OR..... IF YOU HAVE GONE REALLY.....

Osho: If we have gone really, then some means must be used. But if you have not gone, if you are simply asleep here, simply asleep here -- there are two steps -- asleep here or we are here. There is no question of there: asleep here, or we come here.

MAHARISHI: FINE, BEAUTIFUL. HERE AND HERE! BUT FROM SLEEP TO WAKING, FROM ONE TO THE OTHER, THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE IN SPACE. BUT THERE IS ..... IN TIME. SLEEP AND WAKING, AND IF THERE IS SIMULTANEOUS SOLUTION THAT WE HAVE ACCOMPLISHED THROUGH ACTUALLY..... IF I BECOME AWAKE, THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT I AM AWAKE. AND FOR ME I BELIEVE I DO HAVE TO BE AWAKE. I AM. SO IF I AM NOT AND IF I HAVE TO BE, THEN THAT WAY I ADOPT A TECHNIQUE, A PROCEDURE, A SIMPLE SOMETHING, SO THAT THE DIFFICULTY MAY BE OVER. THE TEACHING OF SPIRITUALITY IS TO SHOW A SIMPLE, NATURAL, DIRECT WAY WHICH WILL PROVE TO BE A VERY LESS WAY. ACTUALLY SPEAKING, ACHARYA RAJNEESH MEANS THAT THERE CANNOT BE A WAY TO THE ONLY PRESENT BECAUSE THAT IS THERE WHERE I AM, THAT IS WHERE I AM, AND THEREFORE, BECAUSE THE STATE OF ENLIGHTENMENT IS AWARENESS OF THE OMNIPRESENT UNBOUNDEDNESS WHICH MY OWN NATURE IS, THEREFORE, THERE CANNOT BE A WAY TO IT THAT IF I AM HELD UP IN THE WAKING STATE OR IN THE DREAMING OR SLEEPING AS IS OUR ORDINARY STATE OF AWARENESS, THEN I AM NOT OPEN TO THAT WHICH IS OMNIPRESENT. IF I AM OPEN TO THE OMNIPRESENT, IF MY AWARENESS IS ALREADY BAD (BACK?) THEN I AM HERE AND I AM, BUT I AM AND THE DEVICE IS NEEDED. BUT I AM NOT OPEN TO MYSELF THEN I HAVE TO BE OPENED TO MYSELF, THROWN TO WHERE I AM OPENED. IF I AM OPENED HERE AND HERE AND HERE IN THE GROSS FIELD OF PERCEPTION, THEN MY PERCEPTION HAS TO BE BROUGHT TO FINER REGIONS, AND THEN IT HAS TO TRAVEL TO THAT FINENESS (?) AND GET TO THAT UNBOUNDEDNESS OF YOUR AWARENESS.

WHEN I HAVE DONE..... IN TRANSCENDENTAL AWARENESS WILL INCREASE. BUT A TEACHER IS NEEDED. A ..... IS NEEDED. SO THAT SHIFTING OF THE AWARENESS FROM THE WAKING TO THE

TRANSCENDENTAL HAS TO BE CORRECT SO THAT IF SOMETHING HAS TO BE ACHIEVED THEN THAT WAY IT CAN BE ACHIEVED IN A SYSTEMATIC MANNER, SO THAT IT IS EASILY ACHIEVED. AND IF NOTHING IS TO BE ACHIEVED, THEN, IF I AM ESTABLISHED IN THE GOAL, FINE. I DON'T HAVE TO TAKE THE COURSE IN ANY METHOD OR ANYTHING.

Osho: .....

MAHARISHI: WHEN YOU ARE ON THE PATH, THEN YOU ARE ON THE PATH. THEN YOU HAVE TRANSCENDED THE PATH, AND YOU CAN ONLY TRANSCEND THE PATH BY TREKKING IT. THE REALITY OF THE PATH IS EXPERIENCE, EXPERIENCE, EXPERIENCE. THE REALITY OF THE GOAL IS THAT WE ARE IN A STATE OF BEING. AS LONG AS YOU ARE PROCEEDING (?), AS LONG AS THE AWARENESS IS NOT OPEN TO THAT UNBOUNDED, PURE, TRANSCENDENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS, AS LONG AS YOUR EXPERIENCE IN SOMETHING.....

QUESTION.....

MAHARISHI: TRANSCENDING ON THE VERGE OF THE FINEST PERCEPTION IS OF THE IMMEDIATE. THAT CAN BE GROSS PERCEPTION OR, IF ONE HAS ARRIVED AT THE FINEST PERCEPTION THAT ONE HAS, THEN HE EXPERIENCES. AND ..... HE EXPERIENCES EVENTUALLY IN A VERY SYSTEMATIC MANNER THE AWARENESS REACHES THE PURE AWARENESS -- IT TRANSCENDS. TRANSCENDING IS APPLICABLE FROM THE LEVEL OF GROSS PERCEPTION, THROUGH ALL THE SUBTLE PERCEPTIONS, TO THE SUBTLEST PERCEPTION. TRANSCENDING, ONE HAS TO TAKE ONE'S AWARENESS, AND THIS IS THE METHOD. WHAT CAN BE REFUTED IS THE PRACTICE OF MEDITATION IF I HAVE ALREADY ACHIEVED COSMIC CONSCIOUSNESS WHERE THE PURE AWARENESS IS ALREADY ESTABLISHED. BUT IF I KNOW I AM NOT LIVING IN THIS CONSCIOUSNESS, THEN SOMETHING HAS TO BE DONE TO LIVE IT. AND IF YOU CAN SAY THERE IS NOTHING TO BE DONE, FINE. NOTHING IS TO BE DONE AND THE ..... CAN BE ACHIEVED.

Osho: The very achieving mind, the mind which longs for achievement, the mind which seeks achievement, the mind which is after achievement, is the hindrance. This longing to achieve is the hindrance. So God cannot be made an achievement. The enlightenment cannot be made an achievement. You cannot make it an achievement. It is the non-achieving mind which achieves. The non-achieving. It can never be an achievement, because that which has been achieved has been always with me. It has never been lost.

QUESTION: BUT HOW DO YOU KNOW IT?

Osho: This knowing, in that knowing, you also know this: that this has been with you, and you were not knowing it. But nothing has been achieved.

QUESTION: BUT YOU KNOW IT AFTERWARDS.

Osho: You have simply awakened that which was asleep then that when you try to go through safe, secure, systematic methods, your mind is a mind which longs for serenity, safety, systems. All that you gain is a big ego.

MAHARISHI: THE STATE OF ENLIGHTENMENT IS NOT INERTIA. IT IS AN ACHIEVEMENT. GOD-REALIZATION, WHEN WE SAY YOU HAVE GOD-REALIZATION, IT IS AN ACHIEVEMENT FROM THE STATE WHERE YOU HAVE NOT ACHIEVED IT. ENLIGHTENMENT, THE VERY WORD ENLIGHTENMENT, MEANS "I WAS SO LONG IN IGNORANCE, AND NOW I AM IN LIGHT; SO THIS, IN THE COMMON LANGUAGE OF IGNORANCE, IS CALLED ENLIGHTENMENT. IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE ENLIGHTENED PEOPLE IT HAS EVER BEEN, IT IS EVER; NOTHING HAS BEEN REALIZED. IF YOU HAVE LOST THE AWARENESS OF YOUR GLASSES AND THEN YOU BEGIN TO BE AWARE OF THE GLASSES HERE AND HERE, YOU HAVE THE GLASSES ON, BUT YET YOU ARE SEARCHING AND SOMEBODY SAYS IT IS THERE, IT IS LOST. IT IS LOST IN THE AWARENESS. IT WAS PRESENT THERE CERTAINLY. IF ACHIEVED, IT IS REALIZED. IT HAS BEEN THERE, BUT I HAVE LOST IT; WITHOUT REALLY LOSING IT I HAVE LOST IT, AND WITHOUT REALLY GAINING IT, I HAVE GAINED IT. IT IS THERE. SO THIS IS THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE ALREADY ACHIEVED. OMNIPRESENT IS THAT THING, AND ETERNAL IS THAT THING. AND IT IS NOTHING THAT I WAS NEVER NOT IT, OR IT IS NOTHING THAT I WOULD AT ONE TIME BE IT. FROM THIS LEVEL OF ..... STATE OF AWARENESS, NOTHING TO BE ACHIEVED, NOTHING TO BE DONE, NOTHING TO BE DONE. AND, THEREFORE, IF THERE IS NEED OF ACHIEVING IT, THERE IS NEED OF BEING THAT WE ACHIEVE IT QUICKLY THROUGH A TECHNIQUE. IT HAPPENS, IT HAPPENS, AND THEN IT WILL HAPPEN AT ALL, AT ALL, AT ALL.

THESE ARE DIFFERENT WAYS OF EXPRESSING. THERE IS A STORY IN SOME UPANISHAD WITH THREE OR FOUR VERY GOOD SEEKERS OF TRUTH COME TO AN ACHARYA AND SAID, "WE WANT TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS." HE SAID, "QUESTIONS TO ASK? ALL RIGHT. REMAIN IN MY ASHRAM FOR A YEAR, AND AFTER THAT I'LL GIVE A CHANCE, AND IF I KNOW THE REALITY, I'LL TELL YOU." HE DOESN'T GIVE A GUARANTEE THAT EVEN AFTER THE YEAR HE WILL TELL THEM ACTUALLY WHERE ..... ARE. HE JUST SAYS, "REMAIN IN MY ASHRAM, AND AFTER A YEAR." WITH PRECONDITIONS, WITH A DEVOTIONAL ATTITUDE -- SERVICE TO THE MASTER, OBEDIENCE. WHAT IS THE RELEVANCE? IF SOMEONE KNOWS A THING, IF YOU ASK IN GOOD FAITH, BUT IT IS NECESSARY TO GET ACQUAINTED WITH THE LANGUAGE OF A TEACHER. IT IS TO THE EXPRESSION THAT WE CAN GO. AND IF YOU LIVE WITH HIM FOR SOME TIME, THEN YOU KNOW WHAT HE MEANS BY WHAT. THE INDIANS FEEL YOU HAVE TO BE NEAR A TEACHER TO KNOW WHAT HE MEANS BY WHAT EXPRESSION. OTHERWISE HE HAS HIS USUAL WAY OF EXPRESSING; YOU HAVE YOUR USUAL WAY OF UNDERSTANDING. THERE MAY NOT BE ANY CONNECTION BETWEEN THE TWO. YOU MAY NOT BE UNDERSTOOD BY HIM. HE MAY NOT BE UNDERSTOOD BY YOU. THERE WILL BE A LACK OF ACHIEVEMENT..... THAT IS WHY FAMILIARITY WITH THE TEACHER, FAMILIARITY WITH THE WAY OF HIS EXPRESSING, WHAT HE SAYS WHEN HE SAYS SOMETHING, WHAT HE MEANS WHEN HE SAYS SOMETHING; THAT IS WHY NEARNESS TO THE TEACHER IS NECESSARY. YOU HAVE BEEN EXPOSED(?) TO A PHRASEOLOGY WITH WHICH YOU WERE NOT FAMILIAR. AND ONCE YOU HEAR ACHARYA RAJNEESH A FEW TIMES, YOU WILL KNOW WHAT HE MEANS. SO IT IS (?) EXPOSING YOURSELF TO FAMILIAR EXPRESSION.

Early Talks

Chapter #8

Chapter title: Bhuribai

11 September 1980 pm in Osho Commune International, India

Translated from: JYUN THA TYUN THARAYA. Published in OTI 16 August 1991.

Bhuribai is very closely connected with me. I have come to know thousands of men, thousands of women, but Bhuribai was unique among them.

Bhuribai's mahaparinirvana -- her death attaining the highest liberation -- happened just recently. Count her with Meera, Rabiya, Sahajo, Daya -- she is qualified to be among these few selected women.

But as she was illiterate, perhaps her name won't ever become known. She was a villager, she belonged to the country people of Rajasthan. But her genius was unique; without knowing scripture she knew the truth.

It was my first camp. Bhuribai was a participant in it. Later she also participated in other camps. Not for meditation, because she had attained meditation. No, she just enjoyed being near me. She asked no question, I gave no answer. She had nothing to ask, there was no need to answer. But she used to come, bringing a fresh breeze along with her.

She became inwardly connected to me in the very first camp. It happened. It wasn't said, it wasn't heard. The real thing happened!

She attended the first lecture... the words and events of the camp that Bhuribai participated in are collected in a book called The Path of Self-Realization. It was the first camp; only fifty people participated. It was in Muchala Mahavir, an isolated uninhabited ruin in far Rajasthan. Kalidas Bhatiya, a High Court advocate, was with Bhuribai. He served her. He had left all: law practice, law court. He washed Bhuribai's clothes, he massaged her feet. Bhuribai was aged, some seventy years old.

Bhuribai had come, and Kalidas Bhatiya and ten or fifteen of her devotees came. A few people recognized her. She listened to my talk, but when the time to sit in meditation came, she went to her room. Kalidas Bhatiya was surprised, as they had come for meditation. He ran over there and asked Bhuribai, "You listened so attentively to the talk; now when the time to do it has come, why did you leave?" Then Bhuribai said, "You go, you go! I understood it."

Kalidas was very surprised. If she has understood, then why doesn't she meditate?

He came and asked me, "What's the matter, what's going on? Bhuribai says she understands, so why doesn't she meditate? And when I asked her she said, 'You go, ask Baapji himself" -- Bhuribai was seventy years old, but still she called me Baapji, father -- "'You go, ask Baapji.' So I have come to you,"

Kalidas said. "She doesn't say anything, she smiles. And when I started to go, she added, 'You don't understand a thing. I understood it!"'

Then I said, "She is right, because I explained meditation -- it is non-doing. And you went and told Bhuribai to come and do meditation. She will just laugh -- doing meditation? How to do it, when it is non-doing? I explained also that meditation is just becoming quiet, so she must have thought it's easier to be quiet in her room than in this crowd. She understood well. And the truth is she doesn't need to meditate. She knows silence. Although she doesn't call it meditation, because meditation has become a scholarly word. She's a simple direct village woman, she says, chup! -- silence! "

When she returned home after the camp, she asked someone to write this sutra on the wall of the hut:

Silence the means, silence the end, in silence, silence permeates.

Silence, the knowing of all knowing: understand it, you become silence.

Silence is the means, silence is the end, in silence only silence permeates. If you would understand, if you want to understand, then only one thing is worth understanding -- silence. The moment you know it, you become silent. There is nothing else to do: Silence, the knowing of all knowing.

Her disciples told me, "She doesn't listen to us. If you tell Bai, she'll accept what you say. She'll never refuse you, she'll do what you say. You tell her to have her life's experience written down -- she can't write because she's unschooled. Still, whatever she has known, have it written down. Now she's old, the time for her to depart is coming now. Have it written down; it will be helpful for people coming later."

I asked, "Bai, why don't you have it written down?"

Then she replied, "Baapji, if you say so, it is good. When I come to the next camp, you yourself can release it. I'll bring it written down."

At the next camp her disciples waited eagerly, with great excitement. She had put the book in a chest and had it sealed. She had a lock put on it and brought the key.

Her disciples lifted the chest on their heads and brought it to me. They asked me to open it. I opened it and took out a booklet, a tiny little booklet of some ten or fifteen pages; and tiny -- about three inches long by two inches wide. And black pages without any white!

I said, "Bhuribai, you have written well. Other people write, but they blacken the page only a little bit. You wrote so there's no white left at all." She had written and written and written.

She said, "Only you can understand. They just don't get it. I told them, 'Look. Other people write. They write a little -- they are educated, they can write only a little. I am unschooled, so I wrote on and on, wrote out the whole thing. I didn't leave any space.' And how to have someone else write it? So I just went on writing, went on marking and marking and marking -- made the whole book totally black! Now you present it."

And I did present it. Her disciples were very surprised.

I said, "This is real scripture. This is the scripture of scriptures. The Sufis have a book, it is a blank book. They call it The Book of the Books. But its pages are white. Bhuribai's book has gone beyond this. Its pages are black."

Bhuribai never used to say anything. When someone used to come and ask her, "What should I do?" she would just make the gesture of touching her finger to her lips -- "Just remain silent. nothing else needs to be done."

Her love was amazing. She had her own way, unique! She doesn't have to return to this world. She has gone forever. In silence, silence permeates. She has dissolved. The river has diffused into the ocean. She didn't do anything, she just remained silent. And whoever went to her house she served them. She served them in every way -- and silently, quietly.

She was an amazing woman.

Early Talks

Chapter #9

Chapter title: Women Mystics

Note: the following are translated from Hindi for the Book Compilation: The World of Mysticism, Chapter on Women Mystics.

All are translated from Hindi talks

I have spoken on enlightened men. For the first time I start discussions on enlightened women. It was easy to speak on enlightened men. I can understand them -- they are alike. It will be a little bit difficult to speak on enlightened women -- it is a little stranger path. Although man and woman are one in their innermost core, their expressions are very different. Their ways of being, their appearances, their statements, their thought processes are not only different but opposite.

I talked on Kabir, on Farid, on Nanak, Buddha, Mahavira and hundreds of enlightened men, but that was just one-dimensional. Today I add the second dimension. That first dimension has prepared you to understand this second dimension, because a wonderful phenomenon happens: whenever a man reaches to the last step of liberation, he becomes like a woman, he becomes feminine.

Translated from BIN GHAN PARAT PHUHAR

Meera

Meera is a launching place for your pilgrimage. Her scripture is the scripture of love. Perhaps calling it scripture is not right. Take Narada's BHAKTI SUTRAS -- sutras of devotion -- that is scripture. There one finds reasoning, method, fixed precepts. It is a system of devotion.

Meera herself IS devotion. You won't find systematic argument. Fixed logic is not found there. There lightning has struck the heart.

In Meera, found nowhere else, is a natural expression of love. There have been other devotees, but they all pale before Meera; they become the background. Meera's star is a very bright, shining star.

Come, let us go toward this star. If just a few drops of Meera's juice rain on your life, flowers will bloom in your desert. If in your heart just a few tears make rain clouds like Meera's rain clouds, and in your heart a melody begins playing as it played to Meera, it is enough. One drop will color you and make you new.

So don't listen to Meera logically, intellectually. Meera has nothing to do with logic and intellect. Listen to Meera with feeling, with devotion. Look with the eye of trust. Push aside logic, leave it to crawl along the bank. For a little while, let yourself go completely mad with Meera. This is the world of the mad. This is the world of lovers. Only then can you understand, otherwise you will miss.

First, a few things about Meera. Meera's love for Krishna did not begin with Meera. Such a rare expression of love cannot begin just like that. The story goes back. This Meera is one of the GOPIS -- devotees -- who was with Krishna. Meera herself has declared it, but the scholars can't accept it, as there is no historical proof for it.

I accept what Meera says. I am not interested in measuring true and false. To me it is pointless whether it is history or not. Meera's statement -- my agreement; when Meera herself says it, the matter is finished. The question does not arise of someone else raising further doubts about it. And those who raise doubts like this, they won't ever be able to understand Meera.

Meera says, "I was Lalita. I danced with Krishna in Vrindavan, I sang with Krishna. This love is ancient." Meera insists, "this love is not new." And it entered Meera's life in such a way that it is clear from the very beginning that the pundits were wrong and Meera was right.

Meera was little, some four or five years old, when a SADHU was a guest at her house. When this monk got up in the morning, taking out his idol -- a statue of Krishna hidden away in his bag -- to set it up to worship, Meera went completely mad.

DEJA VU happened. A memory from a previous existence came. That statue was such that picture after picture began opening. That statue became a catalyst -- and once again the story began. It shocked her. Krishna's form returned to her memory. Again that dark face, those wide eyes, that crown of peacock feathers, the flute-playing Krishna -- Meera went back thousands of years in her memory.

She started to cry. She began begging the sadhu for the statue. But the sadhu also had great affection for his idol. He refused to give it; he traveled on.

A whole day passed. She ate no food, and drank no water. From her eyes tears flowed -- on and on she cried. Her family was alarmed, now what can be done? The sadhu has gone, where can he be found? And will he give it up? Very unlikely.

And this statue of Krishna was certainly very lovely -- the rest of the family felt it too. They had seen many idols, but in this one there was something alive, there was something alert, the aura of this statue was something more.

Certainly someone had carved it with love, not just for trade. Someone had carved it with feeling. Someone had put his total prayer, his full worship into it; or someone who had once seen Krishna had carved it. But the statue was such that Meera was gone, she simply forgot this world. For her the idol must be brought back to stay, if not she will die. This is the beginning of VIRAH -- deep longing for God -- at the age of four.

That night the sadhu saw a dream. Far away in the next village he slept. A dream in the night -- and Krishna was standing there. He said, "Return the statue to whom it belongs. You have kept it for many years, this was a guardianship, but it is not yours. Now don't carry it on unnecessarily. You go back and give the statue to that girl. It is hers, give it back. It is hers, your caretaking is over now. You have arrived where you were to deliver it, now the matter is finished." The idol is for the one whose heart contains love for it. Who else?

The sadhu was scared. Krishna had never shown himself to him before. For years he had been praying and worshipping to this same idol -- flowers were offered, bells were rung. Krishna had never appeared. He became very frightened. He fled back in the middle of the night. Arriving at midnight he woke everyone up and said, "You must forgive me, I have committed a great wrong." He fell at the feet of that little girl, gave her the statue and went back.

This event, happening at the age of four or five, reopened her vision. Again the love flowed, again the journey began. Thus a deep relationship with Krishna was started again by this Meera in this lifetime.

This small, accidental event, happening when she was four or five years old... and a revolution happened. Meera remained ecstatic, as if she'd drunk liquor. By the time Meera was thirty-two or thirty-three years old, all those who had been important in her life until then had died. Everyone that her affection went out to, that she had loved, they all died.

Those who have written books about Meera, they all say, "unfortunately." I can't say that. I will say, "most fortunately," because for me there is no such feeling toward death that it is necessarily some form of curse. It all depends on you. Meera used it rightly. Wherever love was torn out, each and every vessel of love gone, she offered this love of hers up to God.

The last stage was staying with her father. Her mother died, her husband died, her father died. There were five deaths passing in a continuum. All her attachments in the world were broken.

She made good use of it. She turned broken worldly attachments into detachment towards the world. And the love that became freed from the world, she offered up to the feet of God. She submerged herself in the passion-song for Krishna.

And these deaths did one more fortunate task -- she was shown one thing, that everything in this universe is momentary. If the beloved is to be sought, seek in the eternal. Here nothing is yours. Don't go astray here, don't lead yourself astray. Here everything touched will go away. Here death, and death only, increases. This is a graveyard. Don't get any idea of dwelling here. No one has ever remained here.

All that she'd seen with her own eyes...

Thirty-three years old is not very old. She was young. So many deaths happened in her youth that the thorn of death showed her totally, clearly, that life is momentary. And then her mind turned away from all this. Turning away from this one can turn towards the divine.

First Meera danced only at home, before her Krishna statue. Then love began to rise like a flood, and the house could not contain it. Then she danced in the village temples, in the sadhu's SATSANGS. Then love started rushing in such a flood that she was no more conscious. She drowned, she became absorbed, she became filled with Krishna.

Naturally, as she was a lady of the royal household, of a respected family, trouble came to the family. The family always becomes troubled. A thousand kinds of rumors began to spread in the community, because the matter went beyond the tradition.

You can imagine -- Rajasthan of five hundred years ago -- women didn't come out from behind their veils; their faces were never seen in public. And in the royal household, even more difficult. And she began dancing in the streets, she began dancing in the midst of the common people. Even though the dance was for God, to her relatives dance was still dance -- there was no difference for them. And those who had been the closest to her were all gone.

Her brother-in-law was on the throne. Wherever Meera sings that the king sent poison, that the king sent a snake in a basket, that the king had thorns scattered in her bed, it indicates her husband's younger brother. Her husband had passed away.

Her brother-in-law was Vikramajit Singh. He was an angry youth, an ill-natured youth. And this was too much to hear... Meera's fame was insufferable to him. Meera was so famous, people began coming from far away. Ordinary people came for her darshan; saints, monks, respectable people came too. Hearing the news of Meera they came from afar. The fragrance began to spread. The perfume was like the musk deer; everyone whose nostrils got a whiff of musk had to come.

This is a very surprising thing. From every part of the country people came, but the blind family members couldn't see. Those people coming became the cause of more difficulty for the family because Meera's fame was a shock to their egos. The king on his throne thought, "Someone in my own family higher than me? This is unbearable." Then he found a thousand excuses, and all the excuses logical -- fault can never be found in them: "She is mixing with the commonfolk, with her veil aside. She is dancing in the streets; sometimes while dancing she doesn't pay attention to her clothes. This is unbecoming. It is not proper for a lady of the royal household."

But consider the stories: poison was sent and in Krishna's name Meera drank it; and it is said that the poison became nectar. It must have become! It's bound to. With so much love, so much welcoming -- if someone drinks even poison it must turn into divine nectar. And if in anger, in violence, in hate, in enmity you drink ambrosia it too will become poison.

In these events that have taken place in the lives of enlightened ones, I look for demonstration of this psychological truth. Meera receives the poison as nectar; then it becomes nectar. How you accept the world is how the world becomes. This world is created from your acceptance. This world is the extension of your vision.

It became difficult for Meera to remain in her village, so she left Rajasthan. She went to Vrindavan. "I'll go to my beloved's town," she thought. She went to Krishna's village, but the same troubles started up. Because he was not there now, Krishna's village was under the yoke of pundits -- brahmin scholar-priests.

There is a lovely episode. When Meera arrived at Vrindavan's most famous temple, an attempt was made to stop her at the door, because entry to the temple was forbidden to women. The high priest of the temple had never seen women. Meera was a woman, so arrangements were made to stop her.

But those people who were standing by the door to stop her, they were struck dumb. When Meera came dancing, holding her EKTARA in her hand, playing music; and a crowd of devotees behind her, spreading wine in all directions, and all drunk -- in that drunkenness those who stood guard were also stunned. They forgot they were meant to stop her until Meera had entered inside.

The breeze was as one wave -- it went right in and reached the inner sanctum. The priest freaked out. He had been worshipping Krishna; the tray fell from his hands. He had not seen a woman for years. Women were not admitted to that temple. How had this woman come inside here?

Now think a little... the guards at the door became immersed in feeling, but the priest could not dive in! No, the priests are the most blind people in the world. And to find a more unintelligent person than a scholar is difficult. The guards too were drowned in this juice. This drunken woman, this ecstatic Meera came, came as a wave -- they too forgot for a moment, forgot completely what their job was. They remembered only when Meera had gone past.

It was a thunderbolt. Once the EKTARA was playing inside and the crowd had gone in, then they became alert to what had happened. But the pundit did not plunge in. Meera came dancing in front of Krishna, but the pundit was not immersed. He said, "Hey woman, do you understand that women are not permitted in this temple?"

Meera listened. Meera spoke, "I had thought that besides Krishna no other man existed. Are you also a man? I had understood Krishna was the only man and the rest of the world were his beloveds, that all were celebrating with him. So you, too, are a man? I hadn't thought that there were two. So you are in competition?"

He was shaken. The pundit didn't understand how to answer now. Scholars have answers to fixed questions, but this question had never been raised before. No one had asked it before Meera, no one had ever asked, "Does there exist some other man? I have never heard of this. You are saying very strange things. Where did you get such arrogance? Krishna is the one man, the rest are all his beloveds."

But troubles were beginning, after this event. Meera was unable to stay in Vrindavan. We have always given ill treatment to enlightened people. After death we worship them; living we misuse them. Meera had to leave Vrindavan. She went to Dvarika.

Years later the political situation changed in Rajasthan; the kingship changed and the youngest son of King Sanga ascended the throne, Udaysingh Mevar. He was King Sanga's son and the father of King Pratap. Udaysingh had great feeling for Meera. He sent innumerable messengers to Meera to bring her back: "This is our disgrace. This is Rajasthan's disgrace that Meera wanders from village to village,

moving here and there. This stain will always remain on us. Let her come back. Bring her back. We ask forgiveness for our mistakes. That which has happened in the past is gone."

People went, pundits were sent, priests were sent to explain and convince, but Meera always gave the explanation, "Now where to come or go? Where should I go now, giving up this temple of my life's love?" She was ecstatic in the Ranchhordasji temple.

Still Udaysingh tried very hard. He sent a group of one hundred men and said, "Bring her back no matter what. If she doesn't come, give her a threat. Tell her you'll fast sitting at the door of the same temple." And they gave the threat. They insisted, "You must come, if not then we'll die right here."

Then Meera said, "This again; if I am to go, then I will go and ask my love. Without his giving permission, I cannot go. So I'll ask Ranchhordasji." She went inside and the story is very lovely, very surprising, very significant. She went inside and it is said she never came out again. She disappeared into Krishna's statue.

This too couldn't be historical, but it should be, because if Meera cannot merge into Krishna's statue, then who can? And she had dissolved Krishna so deeply into herself, couldn't Krishna at least let her be merged into himself? If not then the whole foundation of devotion will be broken. Then the trust of the devotee will be broken. Meera has dissolved Krishna so deeply into herself, then Krishna too has a responsibility.

Be aware, don't take this as a fact and sit thinking over it. This is truth and truth is very different from fact. Truth is far above facts. Just what is there in facts? Not worth two cents. Fact is not the limit of truth. Fact is that which man's small intelligence can understand. It is a fragment of truth; truth is vast.

If you ask me, I say it is so. Is has to be. If not, the devotee's trust is wrong.

Meera must have said, "Now what's your feeling, shall I go now? Where will I go? Either come with me or take me into you." Ultimately that which you love, you become.

Love with care and understanding. Make your friendships with awareness. Because this friendship is no ordinary matter. Meera's friendship was with Krishna, and if finally she merged into his image then to me this seems to be completely right. It must be so. It is just so.

Translated from MAINE RAM RATAN DHAN PAYO

Sahajo

In Sahajo, woman appears in utter purity. Man and woman are two dimensions. And if you clearly understand the difference between the two, the songs of Sahajo will be clear to you. Don't try to understand them as a man. Just forget who you are, otherwise your conditioning will create the barrier.

Sahajo was a sannyasin, a celibate. She didn't have a family. The world didn't attract her. She left everything at the master's feet. Those feet were her home, those feet were her family. Here is her total acceptance of God.

And I would not ask of Sahajo that she should be in a family, should become a wife, a mother. If she had asked me, I would have said, "Do whatever you feel like. Don't force anything on yourself."

Her celibacy was not forced... because nobody ever saw Sahajo in misery. She was always happy, ever-blossoming like a flower. Nobody could find a reason for there to be any other direction to her life than what she had chosen. That was her direction.

It is said that the fruits are the proof of the tree; then the achievement of a life is proof of the life. If Sahajo attained the ultimate bliss in her life, it means she lived life as she should have. If she could be ecstatic, if her lotus could blossom, then it is the proof that the way she lived was right; otherwise the flower could not have blossomed.

Sahajo sings:

I OFFER EVERYTHING TO CHARANDAS. I CAN LEAVE GOD BUT NOT THE MASTER.

God has been found in the feet of the master, Charandas. Everything is offered to him. "I can leave God but not the master" -- as God has taken form in Charandas.

Charandas was a very simple man. So simple that the ordinary man could not differentiate between himself and Charandas. He was very ordinary.

And remember, you can be saved only if you can catch the glimpse of the extraordinary in the ordinary. Only then do you know that there is someone who is so close but is still far away; who is so close sometimes that you start doubting that there is any difference between you and him -- perhaps he is also drowning with us.

So Charandas was a very simple man. He saved Sahajo. That is why Sahajo goes on singing his songs. She says, "Even if I have to drop God, I will drop him, but I will never leave the master. Because God threw me into the midstream and drowned me, the master saved me and brought me back to the bank." Hence, "I can leave God, but cannot forget the master."

Nobody would have known about Charandas. Sahajo's songs brought his name to the masses. He had two disciples -- Sahajo and Daya, like two eyes of a man, like two wings of a bird. Both sung the songs of Charandas. So people came to know.

Soon we will talk about Daya. And her songs are so similar. They are bound to be, because the same master has saved them, they have found shelter under the same master, and the same master's heart was beating in them. Their songs come from the same source. That is why I have named the series of discussions on Sahajo, "BIN GHAN PARAT PHUHAR, Raining Without Clouds" -- these are the words of Daya.

When I speak on Daya, then the series will have the words of Sahajo, "JAGAT TARAIYA BHOR KI, World: The Morning Star." As the setting star of the dawn, just about to disappear, such is this world -- "World: the morning star."

It is as if they are both the beatings of the same heart. That is why for Sahajo I used Daya's words, and for Daya I will use Sahajo's words.

Translated from BIN GHAN PARAT PHUHAR

HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT SAHAJO WAS ENLIGHTENED? ARE JUST HER WORDS PROOF ENOUGH?

The question is a little difficult. Words cannot be proof enough, because words can be borrowed. Whatever has been said can be the repetition of what has been said by someone else. Hence words cannot be a sufficient proof, but they can be an insufficient proof. They can give a hint that perhaps this person has known.

An enlightened person's words will be spontaneous. They are just coming from the source -- fresh and new. These coins are just being minted, they have not been used in the market.

The words of Sahajo have just come from the mint. Sahajo is not a scholar, nor is she a poet. Her words are simple and straight -- there is not much fuss, nothing has been hidden. And she has spoken in such a way as no one else has before. So there was no way to borrow.

Whenever God descends into someone, he descends in a new way each time; God does not like repetition. Every single verse of Sahajo is unique. Never before and never after have there been such verses. So words are insufficient proof. Nothing becomes certain by them, they are just possibilities, hints. Then, how do I say that Sahajo was enlightened?

The empty spaces between the words have to be read, the empty spaces between the lines have to be read. The lines will give the insufficient proof, in that empty space the sufficient proof will be found.

But you will be able to read the empty space between Sahajo's words if you have read the empty space inside you. That is why I said that the question is a little difficult. It will not be solved by my answering. It will be solved when the answer comes from your own life.

Sahajo is enlightened; this you will understand only when you become enlightened. The one who is enlightened, will immediately recognize whether another person is enlightened or not.

Translated from BIN GHAN PARAT PHUHAR

Daya has trodden the path and is acquainted with it. She has left no stone unturned on that path. She has died in the dust of the path. Treading on the path, traveling on the path she has become empty in every way. Now just the fragrance of the path is there. That very fragrance has appeared in her small verses.

Daya belongs to those devotees who have left no information about themselves. They drowned so much in singing songs of the divine that no time was left for leaving information. Just the name is known.

Now what is special about a name? Any name would do. But one thing is certain, she has remembered the name of her master -- she has sung songs of the divine and remembered the name of her master. Her master was Charandas; his two disciples -- Sahajo and Daya. Charandas has called them his two eyes.

Both remained in his service their whole life. When you have found the master, service is the discipline; just to be close is enough. Whether they practised anything else is not known. But this is enough. If someone has achieved, it is enough to be with him. When you pass through a garden, your clothes catch the fragrance of the flowers. If you are with the one who has known, your being catches the fragrance. The fragrance flows, spreads. So they must have been massaging his feet, preparing food for the master, fetching water, doing just small errands.

There is not much of a difference between their verses either. The master is the same, so whatever has flown through them cannot be very different. Both drank from the same cup -- the same taste.

And they come from the same village, in the same region that Meera came from. Blessed is that region, because no other region has the prerogative of giving birth to three women mystics together.

TRANSLATED FROM: JAGAT TARAIYA BHOR KI

Early Talks

Chapter #10

Chapter title: Man & God--The Spiritual Dimension of Life

This discourse is published as Part 3, Chapter 1 of "The Mind of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh".

We begin the journey in search of the Supreme Truth. 'Meditation' is going to be our 'via media'. I shall only light the path for you. Then onwards you shall make the journey on your own spiritual strength. Therefore, do not merely lend me your ears but listen to me with attention and then translate the thoughts into action.

Mere high thinking is of little use. Good thinkers are an asset to humanity but it is the 'doers' who breathe life into those thoughts by applying them to the day-today activities

Action is taking the first step to the Temple of God which resides within each of us, and the first step towards the discovery of truth. Then onwards, progress will follow as a natural consequence. For the path of falsehood is the path of dishonesty and of inner conflicts! There is no conflict when Truth becomes our guiding star. Truth brings serenity.

Caught in the cobwebs of words we sit motionless. Life passes us by, but we gaze at it with vacant eyes. Yet, our thoughts can become the steps of the staircase which are to lead us to the Temple within us.

The path is within our reach all the time but many turn it into only a pile of thoughts by not making use of it. Whether in a spiritual or earthly way, a staircase is a step by step progress towards either higher thinking or an higher abode.

Each man is engaged in two types of journeys. One is in the world that is outside him--his earthly destination. The other journey is within himself.

Our mortal life may bring success or failure. But it is of no significance as, when death opens its jaws, man enters it alone, living behind all worldly awards and tribulations. The body is reduced to nothingness-- to ashes.

In the journey within, Truth exists as an immortal element. It has no death because it is indestructible. The inner journey leads to the conquering of all conflicts and to lasting peace.

I shall only direct you to the path that leads to the discovery of self as the rest of the time you have to be on your own.

The first step, as I have said earlier, is the most important step in any experiment. The correctness of this step decides the nature of our direction and the ultimate conquest of the goal we have set before us.

In view of this fact, it is very essential that you should be present here not only in body but in mind also. Man's mind is a very slippery thing. It always lingers on behind on past events. Man's body may move on but his mind stealthily escapes him to keep company with the past. The reason for this contradictory phenomenon is that man's memory is associated only with past events. Man's consciousness is welded to the past.

It is a fallacy to believe that the past is the source of our inspiration. For. what is past, is no more, if it seems to exist, it is an illusion. There is no yesterday. Only today, only the present exists. Like the figures on the silver screen, the past has no real dimensions! Shed, therefore, even the memory of past events. Let your mind be cleansed of all that is unwanted so that you may begin on the journey within, without hindrance, without unnecessary delay.

Let us live only in the present, let the past be relegated and let the future worry about tomorrows. For the purpose of meditation neither exists.

We must let yesterday die so that today may be born. Look at Nature during winter. The trees shed their old barks, leaves fall off, flowers grow no more, rarely a bird or two sit on the bare branches. Then a miracle takes place. Slowly the branches turn to a fresh green colour. Tender, shiny leaves begin to cover them. Gradually, colourful flowers decorate the branches and birds hop from branch to branch in sheer ecstasy, chirping with joyfulness! A rebirth has taken place. The trees, which only a while ago, looked old and withered have acquired new beauty and new strength!

Let therefore yesterday become a corpse so that today we might be reborn with new joys, new hopes, new vigour.

Man's body cannot escape aging, but his soul need not age with it. It is in man's power to keep it eternally young by discarding the heavy load of yesterdays. The man who makes the past his inspiration

bends down under its weight, wears himself out under its pressure and his soul also grows old with his body.

In the quest for God, one must die daily so that one may be reborn with added vigour, freshness and joy.

Once an angry man came to Buddha and without saying a word spat on him. Buddha, unperturbed, wiped off the spit and said to the man, "Is there something more you would like to say to me friend?"

Buddha's disciple Anand, looked at his Guru in surprise! Instead of reprimanding the offender his Guru was showering sympathy on him.

The angered man was himself taken aback as he had come prepared for the worst. But Buddha had addressed him as 'friend' and in utter shame he went away.

Buddha saw the questioning look on Anand's face and said, "When words fail, an angry man expresses himself in strange ways! His spitting at me also was a language. In contrast, when a man's heart is overflowing with joy he holds another to his heart. This too i6 a kind of language!"

Next day, the offender, full of remorse returned to the place where he had only the previous day insulted Buddha, and begged for his forgiveness.

Buddha smiled compassionately and said, "my friend much time has elapsed between yesterday and today. Such water has flown under the bridge. Do not waste your time on what has happened. Live in the present. At the most do not repeat the performance! You spat at me, I wiped it off. That was the end of it."

The second step to our goal is the practice of silence total silence. Most of us are afraid of silence! We mistake silence for loneliness. Loneliness fills our mind with the thoughts of Death and death frightens us! If each one made a list of all that he had been thinking throughout the day, he would be shocked to see that the major portion of his thinking and speech was a sheer waste of time!

Silence will become a pleasure once its importance and utility are recognised. Speak not at all. If speech becomes imperative, let it be in the form of the shortest telegraphic message. And in this golden silence we shall find an alertness of our senses. He, whom we have been searching, will make His presence felt.

For many, the beginning itself becomes an end and thus. they fail to reach the goal which in fact, is so much within their grasp. The Shastras Scriptures--the Bible, the Geeta, the Ramayana, Mahabharata, Koran are read through mechanically. Therefore the goal escapes us!

Incessant talking, shaking of hands or legs, repeatedly changing our postures--these are all outward expressions of restless, frightened and confused minds.

A man makes circles with his big toe, minutes on end. Ask him to stop it. At first he will deny that he was ever doing so. Then he will reluctantly accept the fact. Ask him why he was doing it and he will be able to offer no explanation. But the fact is that a restless .mind conveys its restlessness throughout the body. Mind is the monitor of all our actions. It is the mind which dictates our thoughts and thoughts which send impulses to our limbs! We sit and listen but hear not. We face a speaker but our thoughts race elsewhere. It is only when we empty ourselves of all thoughts that we are able to grasp the meaning of the words which until then were mere words. Man is so allergic to silence, and will do everything to break even another man's silence.

The third and the final step is as important as the first and the second. We will keep our eyes downcast all the time--even closed when possible. A wandering eye picks up many unnecessary objects and registers as many unwanted incidents. This can divert attention from our goal. Downcast eyes will give us enough vision not to stumble against objects but it will protect us from all unwanted sights.

To sum up: (1) A mind free of the impressions of all that is past, (2) absolute silence and (3) downcast eves will be the essential equipment in discovering him who is all the time dwelling within us but whose presence we have crowded out by the junk we carry within.

While meditating, the mind and body will have to be completely relaxed. Most people are in a state of eternal tension. Tension is a deadly enemy of peace. Tension means conflict and conflict is another name for tension. Tension has become so much a natural consequence of the modern day hectic living that humanity has ceased to even remember that man can relax! For the modern man relaxation at the most means change of activity. But it is not so. You have therefore first to become conscious of the tension within you, which has so far become a part and parcel of your life. First, close your fists as hard as you can. Then let them loose. Open your eyes as wide as you can and stare at some object. When you do this consciously, you begin to feel the tension. Then. when you let them close or droop, you will feel tension disappear. This applies to every fibre in your body. Gradually, a new consciousness will awaken in you. In course of time relaxation will become a natural state just as tension is so today!

Every day. each one of you must spend an hour or two at least in a brisk walk on the beach. The breathing at that time should be deep and the eyes, as at every other moment, must be downcast. A wonderful exhilarating peace will then descend upon you.

Meditation must be done morning and evening. Your mind too must be relaxed. It must be free of all self- created problems.

To reach the innermost centre of our heart--the 'Temple of God'--we will have to pass through four chambers. On each of these I shall give you detailed discourses. These chambers are called (1) Compassion. (2) Friendliness (3) Cheerfulness and (4) Renunciation. With the opening of each door we shall be drawn nearer, and nearer to our goal with a magnetic force. When "Renunciation" the last chamber is reached, we shall have shed everything unwanted and become one with the supreme force. By this time we shall have got rid off all false values and our masks. With a completely detached mind we shall become One with Him."

COMPASSION

Let us examine the four chambers through which it is necessary to pass before one achieves a life of Godliness. God dwells in each of us but we look so much outside for him that we miss seeing him dwelling within our otherwise mortal frame itself!

When we have finally reached him through the four chambers called Compassion, Friendliness, Cheerfulness and Indifference, our Soul will get liberated from worldly possessions and all the accompanying evils. Our small limited world (of friends and relations) will widen out in every direction to include the Universe-- the animate and the inanimate.

Let us knock on the doors of the first chamber called Compassion. There may be many who have no awareness of its existence yet. This need not cause despair. It is better to be late than never.

Those of you who wish to enter the chamber of Compassion can start from this very moment to understand its nature and to put it to practical use.

Compassion signifies a feeling of sympathy for one in trouble, for the suffering and the unhappy. Normally. this is felt by most. for those only who are, in a practical and personal way, near and dear to them, they call it love. But it has limited implications. The compassion we wish to discover within us is a love for humanity as a whole. It seeks no personal gain nor is given under certain conditions. It does not discriminate. The incapacity to feel for those who are of no personal value to us has made man even harder than a stone. One does not have to go far but only turn within oneself and make an honest introspection to realise that if humanity had not turned hard-hearted, the world would not be in the state in which we find it today. People of every nation are sitting practically on a bed of thorns, apprehensively for an outbreak of war. From generations mankind has shown shockingly inhuman, unscrupulous, destructive and sadistic tendencies. His core of hardness has become such a part and parcel of man's life that he has ceased to be aware of it. But you should be able to uproot it out of your system and you can--if only you will it.

It is a universal trait in man, that when an analysis is made of his shortcomings he always begins with someone other than himself! This defensive attitude must be offset by analysing our own and cultivating Compassion.

Henry Thoreau, an amazing personality, once had a visitor. He rushed forward with a love-filled heart to receive him. With great warmth he took his visitor's hands into his own but the very next moment he released them. His visitor's lack of response affected him like frostbite.

Let each one of us search his own heart! Let each one of us ask, "Am I dead or alive? Has somebody's misfortune, somebody's unhappiness, somebody's sorrow ever moved me'? Has my heart cried out for him in love, friendliness and sympathy? Does the blood in my veins carry a selfless warm sympathetic awareness of humanity?"

Almost all of us are more dead than alive. We have senses. the five (Indriyas) senses, but our ears hear no cry of anguish. our eyes are closed to another's bleeding wounds. our touch sends no current of sympathy! Each one of us lives for himself! The entire humanity is infected with canker of coldness and heartlessness.

Let us, therefore, each one of us, examine the remotest corner of his heart and dispel the darkness by letting in the bright rays of universal love, universal friendliness, brotherhood and humaneness.

Let each one ask of himself, "Has there been even a moment in my life when I have put aside self to help and solace another human being? Have I ever felt for another a love in the vastness of which I have washed away my littleness? Has ever the glow and warmth of compassion shown by me,'given hope and breath to those dying of despair?"

Compassion has to be an important element of our character. It is not a sentiment which can be ordered at will. It is not a virtue which can suddenly sprout from the soil of selfishness! One cannot say, "Oh, I may have set boundaries for my love but when required I shall be compassionate to others." No, such an

achievement is impossible. Compassion has to be an inseparable thread woven into the pattern of a man's daily thinking! Then alone it can visibly express itself on all occasions.

The love which is imprisoned tends to make the giver and receiver both egoists. An egoist never loves unselfishly. To ask the sun not to shine on the neighbour's house is to ask him not to shine at all A love that enjoys freedom of expression on a universal scale becomes strong and lasting. Then, even individuals can bask in its warmth. For example, look at the trees! As the trees grow higher, the deeper do its roots enter. It is a phenomenon not difficult to understand! So is it with love. The wider its scope, the deeper is its depth.

Ashoka, the Emperor of Emperors, was once passing through his city accompanied by his Minister and saw a 'fakir' begging for alms! Ashoka got off his horse and touched the feet of the poor man. His Prime Minister looked at him aghast. As soon as they were within the privacy of the palace, the Minister said to the King, 'Sire, forgive me for being outright in my speech, but what prompted you, the Emperor of Emperors to touch the feet of the beggar--a mere fakir?"

Ashoka merely smiled. Some months elapsed. The Emperor summoned the Minister one day and told him as an experiment to send a man around the city with the heads of a slaughtered cow, a slaughtered lamb and a slaughtered man and to dispose them off.

The Prime Minister was shocked, but all the same he sent his men around the city with the strange baggage for sale. The cow's and the lamb's head found a customer, but there was no buyer for the man's head!

The King ordered that the head should be offered as a gift.

The men returned once again with that unwanted human head. Emperor Ashoka looked at his Minister meaningfully and said, "Do you get my point? Months ago you were asking me why I, a King of kings, should have got off the mount and touched a mere beggar's feet! This is the answer to it my dear friend. Man is so insignificant when death embraces him that not even as a free gift would anyone want his body--no, not even your Emperor's head.

A human being is worth nothing, be he a king or a scholar. It is what he lets go that has meaning and significance. Money, position and learning grow with sharing. In possession alone they die a sad death.

A husband, a wife, a son, a father, a mother, a daughter or an uncle, or somebody's friend--all have one eternal tale of woe, "Nobody loves me!"

What a tragedy! What ignorance! When will man understand that love is not to be demanded. Love is to be given. The more it is poured out the more it is returned. Love is not a bargain! Love cannot be ordered in the market! It is within us and it is for sharing, for giving, for spreading it around like sunshine.

Our eyes see but without emotion. When the lips are silent let your eyes be eloquent. Let their depth be filled with the language of your heart. Do not just look at these tall trees. at the playful waves of the sea but let the beautiful sight gladden your hearts and bring a sparkle to your eyes. Even a stony path, over which you may walk should send a shiver of pleasant emotions through you. Whether you touch a branch of a tree or flower, whether you take somebody's hand in yours. whether you receive somebody in your embrace, let the gestures stir and move the deepest recesses of your heart with the warmth of

appreciation. Make every act of love a memorable one. Come out of yourself to receive life with both hands spread out in a gesture of wild joy and friendliness, in a gesture of understanding and welcome. For a long time we have been educating ourselves only to restrain from this and from that. Let us break through he hard walls of false values and let ourselves go. Suppression in every sphere has been for too long our evil companion leading to hypocrisy and to falsehoods! We have covered truth for a long time with the glittering but false cloak of false modesty. Let us break down the boundaries and let our love gush out in all its purity and richness!

If one wants to live life with sincerity and intensity one must be prepared even for being labelled 'mad'. Conventionally correct behaviour is not necessarily honest! Conventional morality is often built on the tombstones of truthfulness. As a result of it we think one thing, feel another and speak yet something else of it.

A great German thinker once paid a visit to Japan. He called on a Sage during his stay. As he entered the house where the Sage stayed he hurriedly and roughly removed his shoes, pushed the doors open carelessly and rushed to the Sage with a curt salute and breathlessly asked for an interview.

The Sage agreed but told him to first offer his apologies to the shoes and to the doors as he had treated them most shabbily pointing out that these should be given due consideration in the daily routine chores. The German thinker was of course displeased and annoyed, but did as was commanded. After his apologies, he discovered the supreme joy which is hidden in the womb of every graceful and good act. He knew then. that even a discourse by a Sage cannot hold meaning for a man who approaches it in anger and agitation.

The education in compassion is best begun with inanimate objects. A consciousness of their existence and a sense of gratitude for the comfort and joy they offer us. will liberate us from the hard-heartedness we have acquired over the centuries. We have turned deaf and blind towards a million little things which add lustre to life.

These stones which give us a resting place, these dancing, leaping waves which sing for us with wild abandon, these tall heaven-bound trees which shelter us, do you want them to think of humanity as a bunch of unappreciative, ungrateful people? When the final hour comes what will the Sun, the Moon and the Stars say if, after shining on us for 50 or 60 years, we have never shown awareness of their contribution lo our being alive? What will the birds, who have chirped for us and filled the atmosphere with their colourfulness say?: What will the flowers which bathe us in their perfume say? That man is harder than stone, that he is selfish and self-centred! In other words, we must be fully aware and sensitive to our environment.

Perhaps, it was St. Francis who, when on the door- steps of death, turned to every animate and inanimate object with love and gratitude and thanked them for the many ways in which they had filled his life with beauty, joy and well-being. Even when his followers protested and tried to restrain him, he staggered to pat his donkey who had carried him many a mile. He wept and apologized for the times when he had been impatient and unkind to his dumb friend who had not once complained or refused to comply with his wishes. The crowd watching the Saint cried out in pity, "Poor Man! In the hour of death he has lost his sanity or why else would he weep and embrace a mere donkey."

Yes. those who are nearest to God are in a way crazy! It is those who do not differentiate between the rich and the poor, between the humble and the great, between the animate and inanimate--who find the quickest union with God.

For easy understanding we may divide the world in three sections. In one we will include all the inanimate objects. We have to call them inanimate because their innermost nature is still a mystery to us. The second section would comprise of nature. its bounty and its manifestations. In the third we shall include all humanity.

Our first lesson, our first acquaintance with compassion must start with the seemingly inanimate objects and then we must let it grow to embrace wider and wider areas until the Universe is bathed in its freshness and warmth.

The King of a certain country once ordered his architect to prepare a blue-print of a palace which would have only one gate. Soon the palace stood up in its full glory with one peculiarity. It had only one gate which was heavily guarded. The King felt immensely secure and satisfied.

A neighbouring King called on him to see the new palace, and both friends were discussing the beauty of the construction when their attention was drawn to a fakir who was laughing aloud.

Being Kings they were naturally annoyed. The owner of the palace turned in anger to the beggar who undauntedly replied, "My Lord. I am laughing because even now, you are not secure!"

"How can that be?" asked the King. "My palace has only one gate and it is so heavily guarded that no enemy can get into it."

"Sure!" said the beggar, "but what about Death?

There is still space enough for Death to enter! I suggest that you get rid of even the one gate."

The king ridiculed the idea but the latter scornfully replied that Death would enter despite all safeguards.

The moral is, that the truly enlightened man has no fear of danger. In fact, he is always ready to face it. He even welcomes it! Danger always persecutes the one who flees from it as it is always easy to attack someone from behind.

To be ready, to be prepared for the outcome of ones actions, is to be prepared for life. It is to welcome life come what may.

A compassionate man is so sincerely and completely occupied with the world around him that his very personal problems seem insignificant and bearable. His outward growth gives him a new dimension and his very liabilities welcome a source of inner peace and well- being.

From compassion to friendliness is but one step further to our goal.

Many questions have been asked. A friend wants to know if total absolute silence is not in contradiction to compassion. Does it not express an indifference to all around us?

No, it is not so. Normally, most people keep talking so much that they forget that silence is also another form of speech, another form of communication. It is far more eloquent and effective on many occasions than speech. Absolute silence is not indifference to our surroundings. In fact it becomes instrumental in achieving intense consciousness even of the inanimate objects. In our useless jabberings we concentrate too much on insignificant objects. We fail to record so many wonderful sights and pleasing sounds.

Talking is not listening. Nor does it necessarily mean awareness of others. Most people enter into conversation not with the intention of being listeners, but with the selfish motive of getting listeners for themselves. We make somebody an excuse for airing our views. We use people as pegs for hanging our thoughts. We pretend to listen to the other person, but inwardly wait impatiently for him to finish so that we may pour out our thoughts. I am sure if a man failed to get a listener tor a while he would even begin to talk to the walls!

A passive slate of silence makes us receptive tc. others. We are able to truly concentrate on what the other person is saying. We are able to grasp the meaning of his words. We are able to get into the other man's shoes and feel his troubles. We become one with him.

Speech on most occasions is an effective way of inviting attention of another person. We make use of the listener as a basket into which we empty our thoughts. The listener becomes only a means to an end!

Silence establishes tranquillity within, rids us of our ego and makes us sensitive to other people and objects around us. An intimate contact is achieved and we lose ourselves in the growing warmth of genuine sympathy.

One day a Mr. X came to me because he was most eager to have an hours tete-a-tete with me. Throughout the hour my responses were monosyllabic. At the end of an hour Mr. X thanked me for a very interesting conversation. I was amused, as it was he who had done all the talking. I said so to him, but he obviously had not given an ear to that remark of mine for he kept on insisting that he had a wonderful one hour with me!

Speech, therefore, in most cases, is only an audible expression given to his own thoughts by the speaker without being concerned about the listener's reactions.

Love is being concerned about another person, that is why a lover becomes tongue-tied in the presence of his beloved,

The man who has come to love silence speaks not to make himself the centre of attention but only when speech becomes necessary either to solve someone else's problems or to give solace to another.

Considering the question of alms-giving prompts a counter question: "Who made the man a beggar--then a habitual beggar?" Of course, you, me and all those who have been taught by religion and the mouth-pieces of religion (e.g. Sadhus, preachers and such people) that to give alms is an act of goodness that it is an act of compassion, kindness. No, giving alms is not an expression of love or sympathy A society which creates and patronises beggars is worth condemnation in the severest of words! But man, interpreting religion to suit his ego, preaches alms-giving as a ladder to 'Moksha' (ultimate release from

rebirth). By creating a class of beggars we are creating a class of lazy, useless and inactive people whose existence does not go beyond the 'physical'. Eat, drink and sleep (at somebody else s cost) becomes its motto. The maintenance of such a large group of persons hampers the spiritual growth of the people.

Poverty is a disease, an epidemic, a sin and a stigma. The attempt of every well-meaning person should be to discourage a virtually dead class of people coming into existence.

Every thinking, good-hearted person, must rebel against anyone reducing his fellow-beings to a state of lifeless existence. To make a man conscious of his status as a human-being, to protect his Soul from being given in exchange for his silent acceptance of poverty should become a conscious duty of every truly humane person. By giving alms, we permanently deaden a man's capacity to be aware of the potentialities within himself. These potentialities could, if allowed to grow and blossom, not only liberate the beggar from his shameful dependence but also inspire him to bring about a drastic change. for the better, in himself.

Charitable institutions in any form teach men to get something in return for nothing. It gradually deadens and destroys their self-respect. It cuts, at the roots, their initiative, reducing them to sub-human beings. Their hearts are filled only with the thought of self, thus driving away from it God and Godliness. And a Nation where the majority live in this fashion has no future. The intellectual and spiritual growth of a nation is in direct proportion to the intellectual and spiritual growth of the majority of its people.

An act of true love and kindness offers no food to the ego nor does it subject any other person lo humiliation. It offers only such help which infuses new life and courage in the one who is helped. It brings back strength and self-reliance to the toiling masses.

Unfortunately, every religion threatens humanity to accept charitableness as a part of human behaviour if Hell is to be avoided, if salvation is to be won! A bribe is offered for being good: "Do this or you will be delivered in the hands of the Devil." Yet, benevolence should have no condition tagged on to it. If a passer-by stumbles and if another helps him, it should not be because of fear of the Devil or the promise of Heaven. Fear of any sort, or temptation, no matter how glittering, should be made the foundation stone for an act of love. For love is God Himself.

Pity and mercy at once suggest the superior status of the giver, and is displayed by those who have in plenty, to those who are in dire need. The giver hardly misses what he gives hut very cheaply wins the gratitude and respect of the needy. This flatters his ego. His generosity deliberately seeks recognition and publicity from man and God so that the doors of Heaven may be opened to him. Pity for the needy is the self-sufficient man's declaration of his fitness to reach God to attain salvation, "Moksha"! In support of this very selfish and egoistic attitude there is also a constant prayer in his heart that the needy should remain always in need. He may thus, with arrogant generosity, throw the crumbs of bread from his sumptuously loaded table. I repeat that pity and mercy are cleverly velveted weapons which create a permanent class of gutless, initiativeless persons. While the beggars are parasites, living on the alms of the rich, the rich are parasites trying to grow in stature by exploiting the poverty of the poor.

Almost a similar distinction is found between the emotions of love and non-violence. Love is an active. constructive emotion. Love wants to give, irrespective of to whom and why. Love has no ulterior motive. Love gives because it is its nature.

Non-violence is a negative emotion. A man's only responsibility in non-violence is not to hurt anyone bodily or mentally. It however does not put him under the further obligation of giving help or happiness to another. It is an admirable virtue by itself but does not make a positive contribution of any other nature as love or compassion or sympathy does. Non-violence is an end in itself. It does not need an awareness of another's needs. It brings a false satisfaction to its observer who says, "Well, he is suffering but I am not the one who has caused the suffering therefore, the doors of Heaven will not close on me."

Meditation (Dhyana) frees man of all self-consciousness. It strips him of his false coatings, his artificialities, his acquired inhibitions and complexes. His soul gets purified and becomes child-like. It is the tragedy of civilization that man has come to consider many naturally helpful phenomena, as shameful expressions of weakness! Man i.e. a male, is particularly ashamed of shedding tears. It has been dinned into him through ages that tears are a sign of weakness. Oh, how untrue it is! Tears, when genuine, have a purifying quality and they relax a person's mind. Tears are shed not only when in pain. To have a feeling of exuberance, of wholesome joy, in meeting a friend, on listening to soulful music, on watching the beauty of a sunset or on witnessing the glory of colourful blossoming flowers or on inhaling their intoxicating perfume--comes to one who is alive in the true sense of the word.

Love uses neither violence nor compulsion. It has its own eloquence, its tender touch, its silent communication, its positive but gentle pleadings. If many of us used this to straighten the path of the erring, the more enlightened, cultured and brighter would Humanity become.

FRIENDLINESS

We have already entered the first chamber called Compassion. in our journey to the final goal--God Himself.

We shall now be entering the second chamber called friendliness. This is the second step towards sublime experience of discovering God within us.

Friendliness can be compared to the water which pours down on the Earth from the core of compassion. Compassion is a silent awareness of the Universe around. It is hidden within us just as' the cloud hides the stream of water within its soft folds. As long as the water is encased in the clouds it makes no concrete contribution. It is only when it gushes out in streams and pacifies the hot, thirsty Earth that it achieves a purpose. Similarly, only when compassion makes itself apparent through friendliness does it serve humanity.

Compassion is the Soul and friendliness is its visible shape without the outward perceivable expression which friendliness gives to compassion, man would be giving only idle, useless, lip-sympathy. Compassion is like a verse silently taking shape in the mind of a poet. Friendliness gives expression to that verse.

It is to be noted that friendliness and friendship are quite different. Friendship, like the conventional form of love is a relationship limited to two or very few individuals, laying no condition and given to the animate and the inanimate in equal measure. The sheer ecstasy of the experience is its own reward.

True friendliness harbours no germs of enmity. It is an independent emotion, unrestricted in its nature and absolutely unaffected by the attitude and nature of the receiver. As friendliness gives no quarter to

bitter thoughts, it evokes no hatred in another's mind. It makes no enemies and has a soothing effect in everyone who receives it.

An interesting example comes to the mind here. Vivekananda, who needs no introduction here or abroad, went to Ramkrishna's house to seek the blessings of Sharada, the late Ramkrishna's wife, before departing for America. Sharada, a simple illiterate lady, took her own time before she spoke out, and surprised Vivekananda by asking: "Narendra get me the knife from the kitchen." Vivekananda wonderingly complied. Sharada then smiled and blessed him whole-heartedly saying that he would spread the Gospel of Truth and Religiousness everywhere.

Intrigued, Vivekananda looked at her Sharada smiled again and said, "I wanted to measure your true spiritual height, When you gave the knife you turned the handle towards me and the pointed sharp edge was held in your hand. You carry friendliness within you. so you shall come to no harm nor harm anyone. An ordinary self-centred man would have handed the knife. with the wooden handle in his own hand, for the sake of safety." A man who faces danger himself in order to save others has mastered the essential principle of Godliness. Friendliness is a warm pulsating emotion expressed even through the smallest action. Friendship exists only when there is a two-way traffic. Friendliness keeps the Heart open to even those who have come to hurt abuse and malign.

Friendship is like the political relationship between two or more countries At one time Russia and America joined hands against Hitler but that was in self-protection. Now there is no such need. Tomorrow if China should expose her fangs, Russia and America will join their forces again. In friendship, each party's first concern is self-preservation. If there is the slightest danger to personal safety, the snake of selfishness immediately uncoils itself

Lao-tse is quoted to have said: "Lucky are those who know equanimity even in defeat, for such people cannot be touched by defeat."

The tall trees which refuse to bend at the onset of a cyclone get uprooted in spite of their apparent strength. The small delicate plants, the blades of grass, even though comparatively insignificant in stature, lower their heads in humility. The winds pass over them and the next minute they rise up again smiling and fresh as ever

The pages of history tell us that Hitler, a power in himself, had not a single friend! He trusted none. He was loved by a woman for twelve years but he did not trust even her enough to marry her! He saw danger in every human contact. Prolonged intimacy frightened him. He expected a bullet, a dagger from every crevice. It was only when the enemy's attack proclaimed final destruction and the end, it was only then that he took the woman's hand in marriage! When death became a finality, then alone did he lose fear of death, then alone could he trust the woman who had dedicated her life to him. An hour after the marriage, both had joined hands in a successful attempt at suicide. Such is the tragedy of man whose ego neither permits overtures of friendships nor accepts the same.

Most human beings are egoists and are therefore afraid of letting themselves go. The greater the 'I' factor, the stranger the ego, the harder is the armour under which man takes shelter from any onslaught of emotions. To him emotions mean involvement, responsibilities and moral obligations.

What a tragedy and yet how amusing too! Where is the 'I'? What is the 'I' but a drop in the Universe'? A wave dancing on the surface of the sea will say, "I am the ocean. Only 'I--and I' alone!" Those on the

beach will laugh and say, "Silly wave, you are there because the sea is there and not the other way round. Do vou know that in that vastness of water there are millions of waves like you? And even they all exist because of the sea? Tn fact you are only an illusion. A pray of water raised above the level by the impact of wind. Your being there is not real nor is it necessary. When the sea is calm and the wind lies low you will be non-existing. But the Sea was there, is there and will be there eternally. You are but a speck in the vast horizon!" So is man. Yet alas, how much ego he has!

Vivid in the right perspective a man's being is an illusion. All his attempts at self-preservation are worth a laugh as what he thinks he is preserving is not in his hands at all. His being or not being is in the hands of a Power which works unseen and continuously. Why then let fear take mastery over us?

When the last tiny bit of ego disappears, complete identification with the animate and the inanimate objects becomes a natural part and parcel of the way of life. Death of the 'Ego' is man's highest achievement in spiritual growth. Then sorrows and joys are not his individual fate. The entire world becomes the focus of his compassion and friendliness, Man acquires the ultimate in self-realization that, 'he is nothing and he is everything'.

A chariot is 'whole' when all its components are assembled together yet not a single component is chariot nor a chariot a chariot without its components. That is how man is.

When Jesus was crucified, his devotees saw blood oozing from their palms and feet. This phenomenon has been intensely studied by many scientists, doctors and scholars, and there is not the slightest doubt now about the authenticity of the phenomenon, The one and only Jesus and therefore, they too are in a way crucified with him.

A truly religious life is a life full of friendliness at all times. 'All before self' becomes the guiding motto of a truly religious man.

A consoling touch of the fingers, a warm, gentle smile, a sympathetic response and so many hearts can be revived and gladdened, But even these little gestures never come to most people. We all know what others should do or should not do unto us, but most of us do not know the reverse of it which is, do not do unto others what you do not like others to do unto you. There is not a man who does not seek sympathy, understanding, tenderness, compassion, love, friendliness for himself and yet how many of us see the same need in others?

How many suicides could have been averted, how many deformities of mind and body could have been set right, how many tears could have turned into smiles how many neglected, barren spaces could have turned into colourful gardens, how many orphans could have had homes, how many childless women could have known the joy of motherhood by adopting these orphans. how many hungry mouths could have known the taste of delicacies, if only humanity had trained eyes, ears and heart to feel suffering of others around. If only humanity could understand that to lose for a good cause is actually to gain an indestructible wealth of spiritual well-being,

In Japan, an old scholar was occupied in the task of translating some of Buddha's works. For the first time Buddha's teachings were going to be presented in Japanese language. Like many good tasks even this needed money. For ten years the scholar begged and canvassed, At last he managed to collect a sum of ten thousand. About that time Japan was hit by a severe famine. The scholar donated the sum for relief to the needy. A sum of ten thousand collected in ten years by begging and pleading, all that

went towards bettering the condition of the famine stricken. His sympathisers, donors and friends were shocked. "Famines and earthquakes come and go. People are being born and dying every second of the day. Why did you have to part with such a precious amount? What would happen to the intended task of translating Buddha's book?" asked all of them to the scholar. The scholarly Sage only smiled.

The Sage was sixty by then, with fresh zeal he again began the task of collecting funds. Learned people had to be summoned to undertake the vast task. And learned people seldom part with their knowledge without remuneration. Once again his funds swelled to ten thousand. Alas, floods hit the city this time and the Sage unhesitatingly donated the money for the needy. Again his friends reprimanded him. He was by then seventy. At last in another ten, twelve years he was able to get the work of translating Buddha's works completed.

On the cover page were printed the words "Third Edition". "What a liar the Sage was! Where were the first two editions? Were the readers being taken for fools--Third Edition indeed!"

The Sage smiled and answered, "It is the third edition. The first came out when famine hit the city. The second when floods reduced thousands homeless A book gives only a theoretical knowledge. The first two editions were practical application of Buddha's teachings. Of what use would have been the books if humanity had been allowed to starve or perish because of lack of help? Only those whose life pulsates with friendliness will understand why I call this publication "Third Edition!"

Dip the bucket into the sea of spiritual wealth and quench your Soul's thirst by drinking the nectar of humaneness and letting go of the ego. Let the rejuvenating, invigorating air of friendliness fill your system and finally, let every sensory instrument in your body become alive with the awareness of the joys and sorrows of others. The water encased by the clouds is of use only when it pours down on the Earth in a visible and particular form. Lip sympathy does not help. Only action does.

To want to know more and more on any subject is a sign of an active, knowledge-hungry mind; but knowledge without practical expression is like so many richly bound books put out for mere exhibition

There are two kinds of love in man. One love says. "If you love me, if you are good to me, if you are useful to me, I shall love you", or in other words it says. "I love A because A loves me, because I benefit by A's love."

Another type of love, which is only another name for friendliness says, "I shall love you at all times and in all circumstances notwithstanding how much you hate malign or harm me."

The love that says, "since you have harmed me I cannot love you anymore" is very limited in its capacity and dependent for its existence on the behaviour and response of another person or persons.

The friendliness we are talking about is love which does good for the mere joy of doing good. A person who has gladness in his heart is not conscious of the joy he is spreading. He is humming a tune because it gives him joy to do sc. This example stretched further would make his singing an act of friendliness. A stranger is sad and needs cheering. Our man looks at the stranger for it cheers him up again, adding a little more sunshine to his own life. Unconsciously, unintentionally his joy has come out of his being aware of another's gloom. His well-being is a result of doing a good act even to a stranger.

Next he meets another person who is being assaulted by an angry mob, and had once been very nasty to him. But then, he is not in the least hitter because of it, and risks his life to rescue him. This man knows

the true principles of friendliness Just as the Sun showers his warm and purifying rays all around, on the poor and the rich, the saintly and the sinners, the living and the inanimate objects, so does a friendly man extend his help to anyone who needs.

Mansoor, whose name perhaps you have heard already, was to he executed. A lakh of people had gathered. An angry, prejudiced mob stoned and abused him, but Mansoor never lost his smile. Before the execution he prayed. "These deal people, little do they know what they are doing! This mad crowd thinks you will be nearer to them if I was put to death! Poor souls!"

But even as he said this, there was no hatred or bitterness within Mansoor.

Falsehood hunts out the most impressive objectives for itself.

When Jesus was brought for crucifixion he was offered a chance to speak his last words. Jesus said only one little thing: "Please God forgive them. for they know not what they are doing." Even as he faced a painful death. Jesus did not lose his calm, equanimity and friendliness towards his enemies.

A woman Sage named Rabiya deleted a verse from a scripture where it said to "Abhor 'Satan' and treat the Devil with contempt." When reprimanded about it she answered, "Until I knew the true principles of love I had accepted this teaching without questioning. Now, however, I know that true religiousness means love for all.

For most people, the supreme form of friendliness cannot be an achievement of a day, a month or a year. There has got to be a constant alertness against the natural tendency of the mind to retaliate.

All wars are a result of the enmity between man and man, Nation and Nation. Wars which are fought to save the fundamental values of life and fundamental principles of truth, give no quarters to cruelty, or to evil. They are never devoid of compassion or friendliness.

This subject may be further developed by citing the war between the Pandavas and Duryodhana. Lord Krishna, as we all know, was at the helm on the side of Pandus-- on the side of Truth. It may be difficult for many to believe that hatred was not the basis of this battle. It may not be easy to believe that at the end of the day's fighting, warriors from both camps gathered together in the evenings to converse. When Bishma, the oldest of the Pandus, was on his death-bed, his opponents gathered at his bed reverently and pleaded for his advice? on religious behaviour. Such then are wars which are fought for religious principles.

As long as there is evil in the world there is sinfulness and cruelty, untruth and irreligiousness. hatred and debauchery, sensuousness and crime, even the compassionate and love filled people will have to rise in revolt to rid humanity of these evils. But such battles will not be battles of wits, of pure military strength or of power acquired through hatred, but will be declared in the name of truth and love against falsehood.

A man must be able to be hard like steel when confronted by evil and falsehood. At the same time like Buddha, he must be filled with compassion and friendliness. The war must be against vice or against the wrong and not against an individual or individuals.

If spiritually tranquil men in great number could be found to run the affairs of the Universe, we shall have no artificial boundaries dividing man from man. Racial and political differences will disappear. Man

will have only one race--only one caste--man.

In quest of knowledge, does the ego help man in achieving good?

Ego cannot achieve good. It is poison. Even a drop of it in the human system can poison all good efforts. The conceited is not interested in doing good but in raising himself in the eyes of the beholders When a mar donates a certain sum to an Institution he deserves credit for it as his friends, relatives and associates will be at the public function, the press, the photographers--a whole paraphernalia to boost his ego.

The truly compassionate man, being devoid of conceit helps the needy without fees. His good act, if it ever comes into the limelight does so only accidently and he humbly thanks God for having thought him fit for doing service to others. Each race, each community filled with self-importance creates its own God. While in fact there is not a single true Temple of God to be found anywhere.

If there was even one such Temple, man would not kill man in the name of religion. The white would not hate the black. Different races would not cause bloodshed and unrest.

Man erects Temples not to honour God but to honour himself. The foundation stone must have his name or the name of the person to whose memory the temple is dedicated. And God has to know or how would the gates of Heaven open for the donor?

The bloodshed that has taken place in the name of God and religion would outdo that of the gambling dens and brothels. The rape of women, slaughter of children. Looting and arson, a hundred and one nauseating atrocities have resulted from inter-racial and inter-communal wars.

If a man really loved his country, his religion or his race even to the exclusion of all others, even then he would be able to establish peace and happiness all over the world. Even considered individually, a country's overall well-being lies in the harmonious and healthy growth of her people. If each citizen would work in this direction there would be no internal strife and international wars. After all, who would wish to give up a peaceful life in exchange for bloodshed, rape and economic distress? Each country is dependent upon all.

All untruths seek cover under the pure garments of Truthfulness! The non-religious men are most anxious to declare their religiousness and their caste marks on their foreheads. Pornographic literature always claims justification in the name of "Study of sexual behaviour!" Volumes on prostitution are published for the abolition of vice, while in fact, they present the profession in such a glittering gown that many an immature girl becomes anxious to wear it. Liquor is always sold in attractive containers. Sensuousness hides itself in the garb of Art. He who sacrifices all other human values in the pursuit of success, money or scientific progress, calls his occupation a noble attempt to better the world! The businessman who untiringly fills his lockers and bank books with wealth, announces that it is "for the sake of his family"! The social worker who neglects his own family says that he is working for a much larger cause!

Man with all his claims to great discoveries and scientific progress--what does he really do about himself'' Once he was in the shape of tiny cells-- gradually he becomes a human shape in the warmth of his mother's womb, then a toddler, childhood and so forth till he advances in age--finally he lies

motionless in the grip of death's cold, icy arms! How does all this come about? Is man the creator of these extraordinary factors?

A member wants to know why in spite of his meditating over "Who am I" very sincerely he has received no answer to it from within, but he confesses that he feels deep peace inside.

When nothing but total peace remains, meditation will definitely result in "self-revelation".

It is said that the Pacific is at least five miles deep and that even the Sun's rays cannot reach its depth. Man's mind has much more unfathomable depth. To reach a state of total peacefulness through meditation, patience and perseverance are necessary. Pessimism and defeatism will not do. One day and for sure, the mind will settle into tranquillity when even the query "Who am I?" will be unnecessary. Self-rationalization and insight into the mystery of God's Universe will be available to you like an unhampered ray of light. The mind will cease to waste energy in different directions. A clear new path of life will be lighted up for miles. Man will become like a musical instrument which is properly tuned and which is placed in expert hands--in this case m the hands of God Himself. A glorious feeling of spiritual well-being, a new warmth, courage and strength will be man's companions till his last breath.

A sick mind always concentrates on the sickness. Once the mind rids itself of it, it will glow with health and vigour, and man will dedicate himself to the welfare of humanity. He will not limit Godliness only to his very personal small world.

Darkness is an illusion created by the absence of light. When light fills space, the darkness disappears. When supreme peace is achieved, restlessness disappears without any positive consciousness on the part of the person.

Many people--the so-called religious persons--are satisfied with small attempts at spiritual awakening. Some count beads, some say a few 'shlokas' (Hymns in the morning, some go to temples, some offer charity. These short-cuts do not deceive God. There are no short-cuts to true spiritual awakening in its fullest magnitude. The search must go on until the goal is reached.

There is a verse by the great saint Kabir. It says, Kabir went in search of God and lost his identity, just as a drop of water loses itself in the vastness of the Sea.'

Later on, he changed the verse to. "Just as the waves completely cover a drop of water so does God permeate through every fibre, every drop of blood in me."

How wonderful. There was some chance of finding the drop of water when it went to Sea but how can one find the drop which is enfolded by the vast Sea itself!

When this happens there is everywhere, within and without:

Peace! Peace! Peace!

CHEERFULNESS

From Compassion to Friendliness and from Friendliness to Joyfulness is but a natural sequence of spiritual awakening

Once one has become aware of the poverty of love which exists only for a few and once one has considerably broadened the conception to include the animate and the inanimate, the logical outcome is joyfulness. How can anyone, who is constantly endeavouring to lighten other people's burdens ever feel the burden of his own problems? He, who is engaged in bringing cheer and hope in the life of other persons, is bound to be infected himself by that positive outlook. The is sure to find in himself also, the reflection of the Joyfulness he has spread around. And such a man knows the essential difference between Religion and Religiousness. A truly religious person can never be gloomy, despondent or defeated.

Unfortunately, in the last many centuries man has turned to religion--i.e. religious scriptures and temples etc. in a spirit of defeatism. When all hope is lost, he turns to God carrying with him a melancholic state of mind and spreading the germs all around him.

Half-equipped priests and scholars make sadness almost a requisite qualification for those who wish to seek the help of religion. Religious places have become like hospitals. What is more tragic is the fact that while at least some physically sick people return home well and alive, in the so-called religious hospitals mortality has been almost one hundred per cent.

What the world requires is a change of this attitude. Man must turn to God with a positive hope-filled, joyful heart. It must not be a pilgrimage left for the very last lap of life. Godliness must become man's natural language from the day he learns to utter his first syllables. It can be done. If grown-ups would not take a negative attitude. if man would guard against egoism from the beginning. if he would make compassion and friendliness the guiding principles of life from his youth, life must maintain an equilibrium all along. Unfortunately. religion leaves the young alone or rather the young leave religion alone, until they, like all their elders, need its help when aspirations misfire, when a healthy body gets afflicted, when the house of cards collapses.

This is so sad! The young, full of healthy, brimming hopes must be acquainted with the spiritual side of life even in the days when God and Religion seem unnecessary. Men have miscalculated the nature of their future, hypnotised by the arrogance of youth. That is why when they turn to God they come as dispirited broken, sick people. Having neglected or even forgotten God ;n their good times, they turn to him, when almost all is lost. Even a specialist cannot save a patient who has come to him too late. God too cannot help him who comes to him as a matter of convenience. On the face of it. it may seem one and the same thing to turn to God as a remedy for one's ailments. to turn to him for bringing cheer into one's life or to turn to him in pursuit of greater joyfulness, peace and well-being But it is not so.

Tn the first instance it is the absence of cheerfulness, hopefulness, well-being that leads men to God.

Tn the second instance men turn to Him to add to their joyfulness. hopefulness, peacefulness. In this case the presence of these assets, to an extent, is presupposed.

There is a fundamental difference in a man going to a doctor when all is not well and in a man going to a doctor in the best of health, just for a check-up and assurance, that all is well.

The first man brings gloom with him--a tiredness or life with which he infects all the others. The second man's springy steps and positive outlook flood the room with sunshine and hope for even the hopeless.

The elixir of joyfulness which is the combined product of compassion and friendliness should become a daily item of spiritual food.

Laughter is infectious. It spreads to the length and breadth of the surrounding atmosphere.

The story of the three Chinese Sages will aptly illustrate the point. These three Sages were never sad. The people had, therefore, named them: "The Laughing Sages". They went from town to town and wherever they went the skies echoed with their laughter. To spread joy was their life's mission. When the crowd asked them for some holy teachings they said:

"Keep laughing. There is no better way to serve the Cods than bringing joy into the lives of those who are not fortunate and adding some more to the lives of those who have reason to be happy."

What a profound message that is? Can crimes be committed by men whose hearts have learnt to smile even at misfortune, at injustice, at pain and frustration? Can men who welcome their problems with joyfulness be ever despondent and depressed and hurt anybody? Crime will be practically extinct in places where people have learnt to begin the day with the cheer, 'come storm. come rain.'

In course of time the Sages became old and one day one of them went the way of all mortals. "Now, now the other two are sure to weep and wail," thought the people. But what a strange sight they saw! The dead Sage had a smile on his face even in death and his two companions of years were laughing even in that hour.

The crowd was shocked, even annoyed at this indifference.

The two Sages said, "Today we have even greater cause to waste no tears. We three were full of so much life and now one is gone. In due course of time we also will go one by one. What an illusion life is! How transient! A balloon has burst. When death is a certainty why spoil life with tears and sorrow? Why not make the best of it till it lasts. You see then, why we have greater cause for not wasting tears? Even our dead companion would protest against our shedding tears if he could speak and ask us to be joyful."

When the funeral pyre was getting ready the two sages said to the people, "Those of you who cannot fight sadness better return to your homes." To face death cheerfully is to know and accept life fully. People get sad and weep when somebody dies, not so much for the loss but because death is a reminder of what awaits them also. But the people could not bring themselves to laugh. For centuries tears have been expected of men at any funeral and their morbid curiosity would not permit them to return to their homes also. So they stayed and watched.

"Before you offer these mortal remains to the fires. aren't you going to bathe the Sage and change his clothes?" they asked.

"No, we have his strict instructions not to do so. and we cannot disrespect the last wishes, so he shall he as he is."

Soon the pyre was lit and within minutes the weeping crowd burst into waves of laughter. They laughed and laughed

Before the last hour, the man had stuffed the pockets of his robes with colourful fireworks. As the pyre was lit, the crackers burst colourfully with ear-splitting sounds. Who could not help laughing in the face of the brilliant joke!

Such are some men! Even in death they leave only the sound of their laughter and the fragrance of their joyfulness behind.

Humanity needs a cheerful conception of religion if life is to be faced with equilibrium and equanimity. which is otherwise defined by religious teachers as lack of mirth. Real tranquillity n-lust come as a result of joyful acceptance of life's trials and not as a result of a negative acceptance or as a result of helplessness and unwilling resignation to the Laws of Nature!

It is a well-known and true saying that you weep and weep alone. You laugh and the world laughs with you. There is a rational explanation for this laughter, i is an infectious virtue. It is communicative.. It is a wealth which is to be shared with others.

A gloomy soul is a dead soul, dried up and dehydrated Only cracks can appear in a dried up soul. Only burning heat can come out of it. That is why joyfulness is an essential qualification for friendliness. In fact they are reciprocal. Friendliness spreads joyfulness, joyfulness invites friendliness.

A man's attitude to life is echoed in everything he does. A negative, unfruitful and defeated attitude begets a similar response from others. A smile costs nothing to the giver. Yet, in return, it brings back such a lot of good.

Is it not true in the case of most of us that, when we face the dawn of a new day, we meet it half-heartedly. almost grudgingly? How many have ever welcomed the new day with thanksgiving? What appreciation do we show for the new opportunities which are given to better our lives? Anything could have happened last night. The final curtain could have dropped. But nothing unpleasant has happened. A new day awaits us. Yet, never do we feel a consciousness of that blessing.

There was a Muslim Emperor. He had a servant who had served him affectionately and faithfully for many, many summers. The Emperor was very fond of him, so much so that, before he partook of any delicacy, he would always offer it first to his old servant. The man accompanied the Emperor wherever he went. Once they both went into a jungle. As they unmounted to rest the Emperor plucked a fruit and peeled it himself. As was his habit he offered a section of it to the old man.

"How does it taste?"

"Wonderful, Sire, but please let me have some more" said the servant. This went on until only a last small section was left. The servant insisted upon having that piece too! The King had, by then, reached the end of his patience. The rotten, selfish servant wanted even the last slice! Before the servant could get the piece the King hurriedly put it into his mouth! Horror of horrors! The fruit tasted disgustingly bitter! The King quickly spat it out and said, "What a madman you are! This fruit is bitter like poison. How could you eat it and even praise it?"

The old servant said tenderly with tear-filled eyes "My Lord, many a time your hands have shared with me the sweetest and tastiest of fruits. Many a times your hands have offered me the best delicacies. If once this is not so, should T complain? How could I be so low and ungrateful. Yes, the fruit was bitter but your heart was filled with nothing but love when you offered it to me. Should I have failed to appreciate your nobleness?"

A constructive mind cannot remain gloomy and approaches life's problems with confidence. Instead of losing courage by the magnitude of his misfortunes he gathers his wits to meet them squarely. How can such a man, who knows no defeat, spread anything else around except joy and cheerfulness?

Instead of counting our misfortunes let us take a mental stock of our blessings and we shall be surprised to see how many blessings we have received without actually deserving them.

There are many unpleasant things--which are beyond our control. And precisely that is why we must accept them, not in a spirit of defeat but cheerfully. Our life acquires the colour we paint it in. If the opposing forces are insurmountable, why waste energy in brooding over the unattainable and ruin even those moments which can be enriched with joy? Why not bow down like the humble tender grass, to the stormy winds and rise up again with least damage to ourselves? Then like the optimist, we shall turn a blind eye to the fury or the wind and instead, smile gratefully that the worst is over.

Men who know the art of living do not give shelter to defeatism and gloom. From the sands of time they manage to squeeze out the elixir of life. In every moment they discover reason for laughter. These men alone are alive and kicking in the real sense of the word. The rest; those who darken the present moment by the shadow of yesterdays and fear of tomorrows are dead even when alive.

RENUNCIATION

We are now in the last lap of our pleasant journey which is to lead us to the 'discovery of self', our final goal. We shall, in doing so, come face-to-face with God -- many splendoured love, We have passed through three chambers so far which are (1) Compassion, (2) Friendliness, (3) Joyfulness, and now we are entering the fourth and last chamber called 'Renunciation'.

Renunciation means renouncing all the wordly values which were dear to us once. All that we had been clinging to as real and essential in the material world has now to be discarded. According to an old Indian custom, we are required to leave our shoes outside before we enter the house. The reason behind the custom is easy to understand. Our shoes carry all the dust, dirt and filth when we go from place to place. The house has to be protected from the uncleanliness. So, not only does the old custom require that we should leave the shoes outside but we are even required to wash our feet to get rid of any dirt clinging to them.

All that we gathered in life as valuable was only collection of junk and dirt. We have to part with this junk for good, before we can qualify for the supreme joy of becoming one with Him who is within us--Paramatma. All the so-called bodily pleasures and pains were an illusion, all those loves and hates too mere illusion, all the glory of material riches and worldly status were also an illusion. Therefore, we must not-- we cannot carry anything with us which will damage the purity with which we wish to meet our destiny--Truth. Factors, which once crowded our mind's cellar with chaos and confusion. With conceit and pride, with self satisfaction and 'I' have to be left out. In God"s temple only that which is clean, peaceful, pure and lasting must be taken with us. In Godliness are combined all these qualities with our system cleaned of all that was sinful and evil--with our senses cleared of the mist of selfishness. greed. malice the ego. we will be able to clearly see him who was all the while within us.

Renunciation is concerned with all that is without. unlike Compassion, Friendliness and Joyfulness, which are within. In short, all the things which are 'without' have to be renounced and also any ugliness within must be thrown away, as garbage is thrown away. Men have the habit of hoarding many useless, meaningless things. When we change our residence we discover, while packing, many articles which we do not need. Junk collects in the cellar. We go on collecting it because we say we may need it some day. That need never comes. When we enter the fourth chamber our soul must be free to breathe the fresh air of freedom from worldly problems. Our steps must not become heavy carrying a load of ugly feelings, ugly emotions, ugly reactions. Inner uncleanliness is as much a threat to our spiritual wellbeing as is physical uncleanliness to our bodily well-being.

Gold is purified by passing it through fire. All that was not gold is burnt away. Men in search of Truth have to go through renouncing, in order to remain with them only those things which are directly related to Truth. Ego, the greatest enemy to godly living and all other factors accompanying it, must be discarded. rejected, no matter how glorious it appears outwardly.

Thus in the fourth chamber, man must arrive stripped of all feathers. All that is perishable: wealth, name, family ties, popularity must be renounced before we finally qualify for God's blessings. Only that which stays within, that which does not perish, can accompany man in the fourth and final chamber. And this is what is meant by Renunciation--casting off, of all superficialities and touching God's feet with a heart cleansed of all impurity.

Through thousands of years we have sacrificed Truth at the altar of so-called public opinion. We have proudly carried the medals of public approval, public adulation, and applause. Greatness which comes from without, which has falsehood as its foundation, has to crumple in a heap one day or the other. Yet, we wish to hang on to it as long as we can. Tenaciously, we clutch at it like a child clutching at a china toy. But once we have begun our journey to the Temple of God, we must be ready to part with our red ribbons, The more quickly we will do it--the more whole-heartedly we will, of our own volition, render back what was never ours the quicker shall we know the healthy glow of an enlightened mind. We shall be set free of one false tie after another. Our wings will flutter with new vigour, our hearts will fill with new music.

Popularity always asks for truth as a stake. If in our quest for Peace and Godliness we need to part from a popular path we shall have to do so. Let religious scriptures say anything, if your reason, your conscience votes against it, then refuse to accept such teachings. No matter what sage, what great figure says it, if you cannot accept the preachings leave them alone. Our conscience is the sentry, guarding the purity of our soul. If we haven't smothered it completely with ugly forces like untruth, lewdness, avarice, malice, debauchery, greed, self-centredness and the ego then there is still a chance to repeal these vicious enemies and attain inner peace and purity.

Let go of every support from another. Stand alone, fortified by your own but dependable codes of Godliness and walk into the Abode of God where He waits for you.

It is a lonely road but it need not frighten those who have discarded their crutches and given themselves in His hands.

This blind race of a blind people must end. Man must experience for himself through compassion. friendliness and joyfulness, the Supreme Sense of fulfilment. And when he has seen Light he must let

the kindly light of Experience lead him on to Him where all evils end, conflicts disappear, sorrows evaporate, false values crumple and the ego makes a hasty retreat. Borrowed knowledge is dangerous. Mere parrot-like recitation of scriptural verses, mere dumb observance of religious formalities, fasting and self-denials do not lead to God. Theoretical knowledge is as good or as bad as ignorance. At times even ignorance is preferable to borrowed feathers.

At the doors of the chamber called Renunciation we have therefore to discard even the knowledge which we had borrowed from books, men and scholars, The only true knowledge is to know that we know nothing. A man sincerely in search of knowledge recognizes his ignorance more and more, With every new revelation he sees his smallness, his limitations with greater and greater clarity. The tiniest pebble, the tiniest ripple of water, everything that we see, touch and feel, acquaint us with the wonderful mysteries of God's creation. The atom, the tiniest of tiny creations of God is, in fact, as great a mystery as God Himself!

Therefore, when we renounce material values we must also renounce all knowledge (which in fact, is only an illusion). With childlike simplicity and unknowingness we must reach out to meet him. Then, having trusted ourselves completely in his care, we shall be rid of all that which had burdened us until then. Our wings will flutter with the sheer joy of freedom and our hearts will beat in harmony and unison with him, echoing the music which in divinity and sweetness can never be equalled by any worldly joys.

Then it will be nothing but Love all along for "God is many splendoured love."

Early Talks

Chapter #11

Chapter title: Man & Man

This discourse is published as Part 3, Chapter 2 of "The Mind of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh".

CONVERSATIONS

DR. GUINEBERT: ACHARYAJI, WILL YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN TO ME WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY YOGA, YOGI AND MEDITATION?

Osho: The first thing about meditation is that it is not something which can be done. In the whole world we have a notion that meditation means 'doing something'. It is not a doing. It is not an act. It is some thing which happens. It is something that comes to you. It comes to you. It penetrates you. It destroys you in a way and recreates you. It is something so vital and something so infinite that it cannot be a part of your doing. To me meditation is something which happens, which cannot be done.

So, what is to be done? You can create the situation in which it comes about. All that we can do is just to be open, vulnerable, open towards the happening. We can be in a situation in which we are not closed but as a windowless, doorless existence--like the Lebanese Minaret. We are imprisoned without any opening, closed from all sides, closed in ourselves. There is no opening. In a way we are dead in our caskets, closed. One can say we have become 'life-proof' as life cannot come to us.

We have created our own barriers and hindrances against life, because life can be dangerous, can be uncontrollable, which again is something not in our hands. So, we have created barriers and a closed existence. The more closed we are, the less we live, and the more open we are, we live more.

Meditation to me is an open existence, open towards all dimensions. open towards everything. Of course to be open to everything is dangerous To be open to everything unconditionally is to be insecure. To be open to everything cannot be the comfortable because it does not depend. on us and anything can happen.

So, a mind which longs for security, which longs for comfort, which longs for certainty, cannot be a meditative mind. A mind which is open to anything that life gives, ever welcoming even death, can create a situation in which meditation takes place. It is to be totally receptive, not towards a particular happening, but towards anything that may come about.

So meditation in a way is not a particular dimension it is a dimensionless existence. Existence is open to each and every dimension--without any condition, without any longing, without any expectation. If there is any expectation then the opening cannot be total.

There must not be something unopened and if you are not totally open then that vital, vigorous, infinite happening cannot be received by you. It cannot become the guest and you cannot become the host to it. So meditation, as far as we are concerned is just creating the situation, a receptive situation.

The last type of ignorant people are those who are not aware of their ignorance. This type of mind will automatically conceive itself as knowing. So this is ignorant knowledge. The other type who is aware of his ignorance, this is knowing ignorance, an ignorance which is completely knowing itself. And the moment you become aware of your ignorance you come on the verge from where knowledge begins.

And the moment you become aware of your knowledge you imprison yourself more solidly. So a pandit. h person who thinks he knows, is a person who cannot he religious. A pandit can never be a religious man. A person who thinks that he knows is bound to be non- religious. Because the knowing ego is the most subtle thing

The moment you know your ignorance there is no ego. So the greatest attack on the ego is through becoming aware of your ignorance, while the greatest strengthening of it is through your claim of knowledge. The second thing which I would like to note about meditation is, your mind must be totally aware of its ignorance.

And you can only become aware of your ignorance when the acquired knowledge is known as no-knowledge. Ii is simply information. Information is not knowledge. But information can appear as knowledge. Even a person who knows is not dogmatic about his knowledge, but a person who thinks that he knows is dogmatic, assertive. One must become aware that what he has not known cannot be knowledge to him. We cannot borrow knowledge.

So there is a difference between a theological mind and a religious mind. Theology is one of the most irreligious things in the human world And theologians are the most irreligious people. Because the borrowed has been claimed by them as the known, and the known itself never claims, because it is its intrinsic point that the moment you know, your 'I' is lost. The moment you know, the ego is not there. The knowledge comes when the ego is not. So the ego cannot lay claim to it. But the ego can collect information. It can quote scriptures. To go into meditation is to transcend your accumulated something which is a must. It is something which is absolutely purposeless. There is something which is intrinsically the End in itself.

There is nothing to be achieved by it or through it. It cannot be made a means. But, as I see it, persons why become interested in meditation are not really interested. They may be interested in silence, non-tense states of mind, they may be interested in anything, and so they cannot be open to meditation.

The Divine comes, rather it would be better to say that everything becomes divine, everything becomes blissful, but it is not longed for. It is a by-product. It comes indirectly. It comes as a shadow of meditation.

This is one of the mysteries of life--all that is beautiful, all that is true, all that is lovely--always comes indirectly, you cannot put your finger directly on it--if you do, you will lose it.

Happiness comes, but as a direct goal. You cannot endeavour for it. It comes when you are completely unaware of it. It comes and overwhelms you. It comes like a mystery.

So seriousness is a barrier to it. And this seems impossible to some persons, to be religious without being serious. All religious persons are serious. So all religious persons of this type are in a way diseased They are not like children playing. A temple must be a play-house where everyone becomes a child and plays with existence. Meditation is a play regained.

The childhood has gone, but you have regained the playful mood. So you can play with coloured stones, with flowers, you can play with anything. You can be just relaxed in a playful mood, not playing at all. In this relaxed moment the situation is created. The ecstasy is created, and there, is the happening. But meditation should not be taken as an act, and the person who is meditative is a yogi.

WHAT IS YOGA AND WHO IS A YOGI?

You ask me what is yoga and who is a yogi. A person who lives, eats and sleeps meditatively is a yogi. His whole existence, everything that he does is meditative. That is to say, he lives in the moment. He is playful with the existence. He is not serious, he has not taken life as a burden but as a play. He is not concerned with the past, he is not concerned with the future. He is in the present or he is the present.

Life becomes a flowing. There is no goal to be leached, because in a play there is no goal. And when in play we create a goal we destroy the playfulness and make it a work. The work cannot exist without any goal. The play cannot exist with a goal.

If me end and the meaning are one, then the thing becomes meditative. If the means is in the beginning and the end is in the end and there is a continuity, a process, then it becomes work seriously taken.

Then it creates tensions, conflicts, burdens and then it destroys your innocence. Means is the end, end is the means. If these are not two, then anything taken with this attitude becomes meditative.

Then beginning is the end. Your step is the last. Your girth is your death. Meeting is the parting if these both can be taken as a whole. If they are one, then the mind becomes meditative. Then there is no burden. Then life is just a leela, a play.

The Cross of Jesus is a serious affair, but Krishna lived in playfulness. Krishna's dance is qualitively different from the carving of the cross by Jesus. The cross must have been a burden. It was a serious affair. So Christians say that Jesus never laughed in his whole life.

The achieving mind can never be beyond the future. it can never cut it from the future. The achieving mind is bound to be future-oriented. And the mind which is future-oriented must be past based. Because the future can be nothing but a projection of the past.

We project our past memories into the future longings. Our dreams of the future are our experiences of the past--painted more beautifully, longed for more aesthetically, but it is nothing but a picture, essentially of the past, projected into the future. But a meditative person lives in the present. If you want to live, the present is the only possibility. If you just want to postpone living, then the past and the future are directions, dimensions.

So yoga is the method, not of meditation, but of creating the situation in which meditation happens. It is creating the situation And the person who has begun to live and is not concerned with any life goals is a yogi, is a renunciate, a Sanyasi.

This is something very wonderful. Ordinarily we think a person who is a sanyasin renunciate, is a person who has given up life and living. This is absolutely nonsense. The Sanyasi is the only person who has begun to live.

It is renunciation of the suicidal tendencies. ll is renunciation of the postponement of living and initiation into life. So, yoga is Initiation into the Mysteries of Life, and the methods of creating the proper situations. There may be thousands and thousands of yogas.

So it is not that India is the only land' which has developed yoga. Wherever, whenever a person has lived. he has created a yoga. Buddha has his own yoga, Mahavira, Jesus, have their own respectively yogas. And to me every person, every individual, has his own door to approach reality.

So no one can follow anybody. Because the moment can never be a yoga, because individuals are so unique that there can be no path as such to be followed. Everyone has to create his own path. It is not that the path is readymade and one has to just walk on it and reach somewhere, it is life, creating a path and walking on it. And the path created by anyone else is not there to be treaded by anyone else, because the path of yoga is an inner path. There are no outer markings and milestones.

Buddha treaded a path, but the path was an inner one, a path that existed for himself alone. No one can go by his path. No one can be another's place. You cannot die in my place. You cannot die my death.

Everyone has to search in total loneliness and in totally dark realms. But the very search becomes the light. The very awareness of being alone destroys loneliness and creates its own courage. The moment one accepts his loneliness, he becomes a yogi. Now he transcends society. That is the only meaning of

leaving the society. It is not leaving the actual society. Wherever you go, you create a society. Even with the tress, even with the animals, a family will be created and society will be there.

Now there is no guru, you are alone. As there is no one to adulterate it, it is so pure. innocent and beautiful. This aloneness is the path, this aloneness is the meditation. This aloneness is yoga.

Still you can ask what is to be done with his aloneness.

Nothing is to be done Because every doing, is nothing but the escape from this aloneness. This aloneness is not to be left and escaped from. You must be deeply in it and you must live with it. You must walk the path of life totally alone; amidst the crowd, with fellowtravellers. but totally alone.

When two persons are walking on a road, they are not walking as two, they are walking as one and one. There are two lonelinesses walking. You must live in the family. but alone. Now there may be five members, but there are five lonelinesses living in a home.

And the moment you understand your loneliness you become compassionate There is a compassion now for others and their loneliness. This compassion is a symbolic indication of a person who has gone into the initiation of yoga.

Everyone is lonely--the wife, the child, the husband. But they do not have compassion and sympathy. They do not behave in a loving manner Because, they are using the others as an escape. The wife is using the husband as a means to escape from her loneliness, and because of this there is possession. There is every fear that if this man forgets her, if this is gone then she becomes lonely. So this man has become an escape. She is not aware of her loneliness. She does not want to be aware of it. So she becomes aware of her husband and the possession. She clings The husband is clinging n his own way. The wife is an escape for his loneliness.

We are alone. The moment this realisation is there. that man is alone, then there is no escape Because there is no escape possible. This is just wishing There is no actual escape.

The wife with a husband is as lonely as she was before, but we create illusionary escapes, illusion of togetherness. Our whole society, our family, our nations, our clubs, groups, organisations, these are all escapes from one's loneliness, A person comes to yoga, the moment he becomes totally aware of his absolute loneliness and aware also that there is no go.

How ugly it is that no one thinks himself worth living with. If I am alone in my room, I am bored. Bored with myself. So a bored person goes to another bored person, and they both try to transcend the boredom Mathematically the possibility is otherwise. The boredom will be doubled. Now the bored will be doubly bored. And everyone will think that the other does not wish to help.

You must begin to live the moment that comes to you. Live totally. Live it alone. Live it moment to moment

Be open, open towards the unknown, open to anything that may happen. And accept it as it comes. The denial, the non-acceptance is the only atheism. The acceptance, the attitude to always say 'yes' to everything and an unconditional welcome to everything that is to my mind true religiousness.

Create the situation and the happening will come by itself. It cannot be predicted by the mechanical things. Nothing valuable can be predicted.

But we cannot predict about life. So one must create the situation and wait and let things happen in their own course.

For example, I have prepared the home to receive a guest but the preparation is not the guest. He may come, he may not come. The Indian word for guest is very beautiful. It is atithi--it means a person whose date is unknown. He may or may not come, or he may come this very moment.

And one may have to wait for him for the whole life. His date is not known. Atithi means the date-less, the unpredictable.

If you are certain that the guest is bound to come, when you are not in a waiting mood. Then there is no waiting. The certainty has killed the waiting. If he is to come, then there is no question of waiting. So persons who are incapable of waiting have created all types of certainties They have said do this, and this will happen.

The happening has become a guarantee. It cannot be. It may be that one has to wait for lives and lives together. And yet he may not come.

With the full knowledge of this possibility, of this uncertainty, the heart becomes an awaiting. To every moment and everything that is happening, the rain or the flowers or the stars, one is aware of everything. because no one knows from where he may come. No one knows his door, his path. No one knows his name. no one knows in what moment he will come and knock at the door.

So a yogi is a person who awaits, who is not asleep. Even in his sleep he is waiting. Who knows He may come, when you are asleep, and He may have to go back. So he is awake every moment, waiting and waiting. And if, even for a single moment, one can be so totally absorbed in his waiting, the 'happening' happens. But that is not a guarantee. It happens, it has happened.

This waiting is the only difficult thing. the only arduous part of it. We are in much hurry. This hurry of modern man is the only irreligiousness, that has changed the whole modern society towards materialism.

In Japan, the word for Dhyana is Zazen, and Zazen means just sitting and waiting and doing nothing. The word Zazen is beautiful--sitting, waiting and doing nothing. Because if you are occupied in doing you may escape from the waiting mind. You may be occupied and just sitting. It does not mean that one must sit for five hours. But if you are sleeping, just sleep and wait and do nothing. If you are eating. eat. But just eat. do not do anything else and wait. Then everything can go on and still there is sitting and still there is a waiting and still there is no doing.

This is meditation for me, this is yoga for me. And this is not a renunciation, but initiation into living.

I am against all types of so-called renunciation because they are life denying, life negating and in a way anti-God.

Persons who seem to be so engrossed with God, are not accepting Him totally, because this life is denial.

They say we choose between you and your world.

To me, there is no choice. The life is divine, the very life is God. So one must not choose. Being choiceless, live it. Be deep in it. Be involved in it, and still be alone, because you are alone. Everything

will come and go and your loneliness will not be destroyed. It is there as your nature. This Loneliness is the basic fact from which meditation begins to grow, from which comes the initiation of yoga and from which ultimately a person becomes a yogi.

But do not believe in dead formulae. Karma yoga, Bhakti yoga, Gyana yoga, Raja yoga these are all dead formulae. There are as many yogas as there are persons to travel on the path. Everyone creates and must create his own yoga. Then only the authentic being can be realised. The authenticity comes through individuality, otherwise a borrowed and a phony realisation is possible.

To me God is Absolute Aloneness. But the moment you say oneness with God, you create 'the other' again. Your God is now the escape, the other. It was previously your wife, friends, now you have created another other. Now it is God. And now you have to become one with Him. If you are one with Him then there is no question. But you cannot become one with Him. Your total aloneness is the realisation that you are with God, there is no oneness with Him.

There is no communion, because there are no two entities. A communion is only possible when there are two. When you realise your total aloneness, then it is not that now you will commune with God, but now you are God, you are the Divine. Even the language of one-ness is the hangover from the dualism of the other.

DR. GUINEBERT: YOU CANNOT TALK IN TERMS OF ONENESS WHEN THERE IS NO TWO. IS IT THE MIND THAT CREATES DUALITY?

Osho: There is no mind now. When you are alone, there is no mind, because the mind is your past. as the other. So when you are alone you are talking with your mind, that is the other, now there is a dialogue.

Your mind is playing as the other, now you are talking with yourself, But when you are totally alone you are alone Now there is no mind and now there is no God. You are the Divine.

So I cannot say, 'you become one with the God', because to say so, is to presuppose the duality. It is to presuppose that God is one, and you are the other. Even to say it is divine existence, is to divide it. There can be no non divine existence. It is divineness or it is existence. Do not use two terms. Say, it is Existence. It is enough. Say. it is Divineness It is enough.

The moment we say 'divine existence' then we create a division. The previous one is not divine, now this is divine. This is not the case. It is One--so the talk of oneness is incorrect That is why we have chosen a word Adwait. It says that there are not two. It does not say even that there is one. It only denies the twoness. It simply denies the two-ness. It says there are not two now

So I cannot say that you become one with God, because you were always him. The separateness was your illusion, now you create another illusion of oneness. If the separateness was false, the oneness is bound to be false. You are one, not oneness There is no one else. To say it exactly, you will have to say that the mind is the other. When there is no mind there is no other.

Just like we put an earthen barrier between a river. The river is one. it has been one, but now an earthen barrier exists. The earths barrier is the only other. The river is one.

And this is the difference between religion and philosophy. Philosophy only creates anti-concepts and religion destroys the barrier. Philosophy says, there are not two, the twoness is false the 'oneness' is the reality. Against twoness the concept of 'oneness' is processed. But the religious man says, where is the one, where is the other. It has always been so. So do not say Divine do not say God and do not say that we have become one with Him. Now the loneliness is the all, oneness is the all, now we are.

Sleep and samadhi appear similar, but they are not. Because after samadhi, there is no survival of the mind. But after sleep, the mind when it is asleep comes back more strengthened in the morning, more fresh. Again, the mind has come back with more vigour to see the two. But after samadhi there is no coming back. This is the point of no return. You cannot come back. Sleep is recurring but samadhi is eternal. So samadhi and SUSHUPTI (Real Sleep) have a similarity.

You can say Samadhi is awakened Sushupti, or you can say Sushupti is Samadhi.

Osho: People 'cling' to discipline... but an unstill mind primarily needs to be anarchic, then only can it transcend itself. You can ordain discipline. Discipline is an outward conditioning. The inner being remains the same. The anarchy is within, whereas the discipline is without. The anarchy remains in the heart whereas the discipline forms a part of the cultivated personality So first, let the tension, confusion. anarchy reach its climax. Let there be an explosion. Discipline will come but as a fruit of it.

MAYOGABHAABTI: AT THE EXPENSE OF ALL THOSE 1500 PEOPLE WHO COME TO ME?

Osho: No, no, not at their expense. Tell them about this method. They themselves will feel it. They will certainly feel the change, the transformation. Let them practise it--just as an experiment with their disturbed mind, their doubts. Let them experiment, just as an experiment. If 'something' happens, then the practice goes by itself. There is no need to convince them. And, the anarchy that is within must be exploded. It should not be stilled or cramped down. It must be expressed in total intensity. The calmness, the serenity, the Nirvana comes not by stilling the mind but by explosion. Then the stillness comes but it is not a cultivated composure. Express what you are, totally. Of course that means madness, because we are mad. So, if you express it, the madness will come out. Even you yourself will feel strange about it, unknown to yourself. It is your own expression, but hitherto unknown to yourself. It was suppressed in the unconscious, and suppressed it is there from centuries and pre-births. This anarchic being is within us, unknown to ourselves. It must go out.

We have hypnotised ourselves to believe that we are normal and sane human beings. This is the hypnosis. The whole world is a great mad-house. We have hypnotised ourselves that we are sane, normal. But, the insanity that is curbed in the background always tries to come up, to come out

For a Sadhaka (seeker), it has been an essential part of many old traditions to know one's self through chemical drugs. Various intoxicants are known to have been used to know the inner being, to know that which is within. And, it is total nonsense even to try to discipline the mind For you have not known the innermost core and are cultivating discipline from outside. the outcome is bound to be schizophrenic. There will be two beings living simultaneously in you and there will be indecision, a continuous conflict within. And, remember. conflict dissipated energy. The first step towards harmony and unity of the being is not the discipline but to know that which is within. And the 'within' so suppressed has been for centuries, that it has become a part of yourself. We are just a part of the system. The inhibited, the suppressed, the collective mind--the unknown factor--is the basis of the insanity, tensions, conflicts, the lack of harmony. There is an unconscious lurking fear that if we do this, something will happen And that is bound to happen. That fear creates doubt and the doubt is again an instrument in suppressing the fear. Just try as an experiment for fifteen days, not more than an hour a day. Intense, deep and fast breathing for ten minuteS to start with. And things will begin to more.

YOGACHARYA MAHENDRA: DO YOU THINK IT IS NECESSARY TO HAVE ANY PARTICULAR RHYTHM OR VIBRATION WHILE BREATHING? WILL IT HARM MEDICALLY THOSE PERSONS WHO ARE DELICATE AND HAVING HEART TROUBLE ETC?

Osho: No, no, there is no question of vibration and rhythm. And it never harms. If you try any rhythmic method then the explosion will not take place. Because then again you are disciplining. So, let it be anarchic. The only emphasis is on depth, intensity and speed. The total being must be involved in it with total commitment. When you are totally involved, the whole body and the whole mind begins to vibrate and the body electricity begins to move. And when you feel it in your body, something which you never felt, then the technique has gripped you.

We never experience electricity in our body. That too is a suppressed part of our personality. We are not as much in our body as Nature has prescribed, because there are so many things interconnected. We have suppressed the body wisdom also. If someone becomes completely vibrated, the electricity begins to move. Then he goes out of the grip of Society--in that very moment. He vibrates so much so powerfully that later you cannot make him conform to rule. He has become something in his own capacity. When energy awakes in its own right you never feel any more that you are exuberant and that have you feel as unlimited power that moment people have declared themselves as God, Aham Brahmasmi--I am Brahman. The first feeling of Aham Brahmasmi I am God--is the feeling of the movement of the electricity that is sleeping in our body. The deep. fast, intense and involved breathing creates that feeling. Then every experience through the body becomes true to us. Everything that we term as real is so because we feel it through our body. Reality to us means something felt through our body. I say you are real because I see you, I can touch you. Reality for us is reality through the medium of body only.

Any technique that creates some new dimension of experience in our body, becomes real to us. No doubt arises then. Then only we can proceed further. That is why I emphasise on the first step.

Now, the second step. The first step will continue. the breathing will continue. Meanwhile, there will be many reactions on the body. It may take many forms. But those all will be happenings and will not affect your discipline.

Y. M.: HOW SHOULD WE DO IT'? IN WHICH BODY POSTURE'?

Osho: You can sit in any way, but it is better if you are standing. And still better if the eyes are closed. You should do this on an empty stomach, before taking any meals. Then, the second step: completely relax the body Relax to give it freedom. Go on breathing. Let the body move; vibrate, dance, weep, laugh; let whatsoever happens happen. Do you suppress anything. The body will take its own course. And, many things will begin to happen. And in the third step, while the first two continue ask vigorously; 'who am I?' 'who am I?'

By and by it becomes vigorous. more and more vigorous!!

During the first step the total attention must be on breathing. The second step will emerge as an outcome. When you breathe deeply and vigorously. the body begins to move. There is no question of relaxing in the first step. Now you relax in the second one. Then after ten minute add the third The body will begin to move, dance etc. Then ask 'Who am I?' This is the moment to ask. Because then you will see through clearly that the body is something apart. You see it moving, taking various shapes, weeping, laughing, crying. You see it clearly that you cannot identify that it is you who is doing it. You merely see yourself jumping, dancing. Something is happening mechanically! You see it as a separate entity. Only when the body becomes an automation. then the consciousness separates itself.

Y. M.: CAN YOU TELL US WHY, IN THIS SO-CALLED NORMAL WORLDLY STAGE WE CANNOT FEEL THE SAME EXPERIENCE OF NONIDENTIFICATION?

Osho: You cannot feel it because every moment you are identified with it. There is no gap between you and your body. What you are doing, your body is doing and vice versa. You and the doings of your body are identified as one and the same. But when the body takes its own course it becomes an automata. The things begin to happen which you never planned, which you never thought of! 'Am I doing this? Am I feeling this? And you know that you are not doing it. You did not will it but the dance is going on and vigorously too. Then there is a gap between the doer and the done.

So now, the body has become an automata. The consciousness cannot identify itself with an automata. That is an impossibility, whereas if the machine works according to your will there is an identification. If I tell this mike to move and if it begins to move, then there is every possibility that I may identify myself with it, because now it has become a part and parcel of me. The mover and the moved have become one through the movement. But when the body moves without your will and conscious exertion then the body becomes a separate machine. Only then you are different.

This comes as a feeling so absolutely distinct that there remains no confusion. That is why I emphasise the body movements. Let them happen. Let go, whatsoever happens Then you see that your body becomes like that of a mad man or like an animal or like a machine. You cannot identify with it, you remain aloof

As an outcome of the second step, you begin to witness all that is happening. The body is moving, the hand is moving, it is taking so many shapes, Mudra.... unknown, unchartered, unplanned. You begin to see what is happening. Now, you are the doer, but just a seer. There is no question of your doing anything. You begin to see. Now you have come to know the negative point that you are not the body.

Then the question comes, 'Who I am?' That too ii an outcome. If you do not add the third step and go on doing the second, there is every possibility that the third will come out of it, and the inner being itself will come to ask: 'Why am l?' Now, if you are not the body, then who are you? Then you start asking yourself 'WHO AM I?' Like the previous two stages this too must exhaust yourself completely.

Y. M.: EXCUSE ME, WHEN WE ARE DOING THE FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD, HOW CAN WE DO IT WITHOUT THE SLIGHTEST IDENTIFICATION? HOW CAN WE MAKE ANY MOVEMENT WITHOUT IT?

Osho: The identification is there in the beginning, but as you move on the identification vanishes. You see that the body has no more importance. Such a clear situation is created after the first two steps that there cannot be any confusion. The result is so dynamic, so energising--just a moving energy--that there is no room for any confusion. Confusion is a part of energy when it is dormant. When the energy comes to its full path the person becomes like a dynamo. That is why 1 am adding the vital question in the third stage.

When you ask WHO AM I? in a vigorously moving stage of the body and mind, the whole body responds. The whole mind, every fibre of your being, everything in you begins to vibrate, tremble and the question itself becomes so paramount that there is no need of any answer. You yourself become the question. For the time being you become the Quest.

It is a delicate process. That is why the first two steps are very necessary Ramana Maharshi was guiding people to ask 'WHO AM I'? in the first step. Then it can never be vigorous. You ask as you ask anything else. The question is simple. When you start asking. WHO AM I?' in the first step, a very little part of the mind queries, whereas the remaining mind, the greater part, just remains and awaits the answer. Then there is every possibility that the answers that one has known that I am the soul. that I am the Brahman etc. will be supplied by the remaining part. This is a natural possibility.

In the third step the question becomes the whole. There is a fourth step also. In the third step you ask the question quietly and with total intensity. You must go very deep, till you become totally mad. Every type of sanity is based on answers. You are a sane person when you know the answer.

The concept of sanity is based on answers, ready- made answers. If there is only questioning and no answer, you become mad. So go deep and deeper. You must come to the peak, for the depth is due to the peak only. You go into the depth when you fall from the peak. The more you become mad and fall from that point, the more sanity is there to it.

To my mind the real sanity is that which comes after the transcendence of madness. Then there is neither the question nor the answer. The mind becomes calm and quiet. Then the fourth stage is reached. It comes only when you have come to the peak, to the height of tension. Then comes Relaxation.

Having gone through the previous three stages each for ten minutes, for the next ten minutes or more just relax, and remain just as you are, without doing anything, because you are tired completely--The policy of 'LET GO' is achieved as an automatic process. The fourth step is the moment of doing nothing. That I call dhyana, meditation. The first three stages are steps only, the fourth is the door. Then you are there without breathing or movement. Just silence! This fourth step comes of its own accord and in these moments comes Grace. You have become a Vacuum, an Emptiness and something fills you which is spiritual. It pours in when you are not. You cannot be there because you are doing nothing.

The ego vanishes with the Doer. The Does is the Ego. You can be in the first three steps, because vou are doing something, then breathing or questioning. But now you cannot be.

Our whole conception of the Ego is just an accumulation of memories of past actions. So the more a person has done the more ego-centric he is. If he has done any social service or any religious ritual, then too he is ego-centric. Any type of doing, accumulated in the long run, becomes a part of the Ego, which is just an accumulation of effects. It is not an entity, but only the memory of doing.

So, in those moments when there is no doing, you .are not. Then something happens. You are conscious even when you are not doing anything. You are totally conscious, silent, just dead, but conscious. Exhausted but conscious...

Y. M.: CAN WE UNDERSTAND CLEARLY THAT IN THE FOURTH STAGE THERE IS ONLY CONSCIOUSNESS WHICH HAS NO MEMORY LEFT AT THAT TIME? WHAT TYPE OF STAGE WILL IT BE?

Osho: You can feel it as a gap. The memory only records the gap. Your memory did continue till a particular moment, then there was a gap. Then it began again and this gap you feel afterwards. The gap, the interval, becomes your memory. Our memory records events and this interval, void, is a great event. It is the phenomenon.

YOGACHARYA KRIYANANDA: WHAT RECORDS IT?

Osho: Your memory, your mechanism.

YOGACHARYA K.: IT MEANS MEMORY IS WORKING IN THE INTERVAL ALSO.

Osho: Your mechanism is always ready to record everything. This recorder here is working. It will record when we speak, and when we are not speaking. the silence also is recorded because mechanism is always there. It records everything and it is more keen, sensitive, more intense. This machine can err when we are silent. The memorable event is a burden, a tension. The gap is a calm, blissful interval and it is dhyana. Experience which is with psychic. Really speaking there can be no spiritual experience. There can only be the interval. The person who experiences was not there. So you cannot use the terminology of experience. You experience a moment which is of no-experience a total gap.

Every type of indication is bound to be negative because language is inadequate, it is just a choice between mistakes. So, every type of religion and language is equally erroneous, because the gap cannot be expressed. But... it can be felt, and feeling has no language and words.

Y. M.: SO. ACTUALLY AT THE END OF THE THIRD STAGE AND THE CULMINATION OF THE FOURTH STAGE, THERE IS DISSOLUTION OF THE EGO... OR WHAT IS THE PARTICULAR STAGE?

Osho: The ego evaporates

Y. M.: WHAT IS THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE EGO COMES BACK TO THE ORIGINAL STATE?

Osho: It comes back because the whole mechanism and the part is there. It was as if you had gone out of your house and you come back. But, now yoU cannot be the same person, back in the same house, for you have known something beyond that.

The more it becomes easy to go out and come in. out and in, the more a new stage comes in which neither you are out nor you are in. You transcend both. That is the culmination, that is samadhi.

Some religions as Zen have mistakenly understood this, as Satori; this glimpse, as the ultimate experience or Samadhi. It is not Samadhi, for coming back is still a possibility. The Ego did not die, it only jumped You jumped out and you have come back--just like jumping on the ground. You jump above the ground, the gravitation is there, the Earth is there, so you come back. For a moment you were out of its grip, but now you are back.

You go out, return, and you think; 'I have achieved it,' because it is so blissful. But you have not known something that is beyond bliss. Each experience then becomes a groove. The gap. too, becomes a part of it.

There are religions which have stopped here. Hence they say there is a soul, an individual soul. They cannot conceive Brahman because Brahman comes ultimately in the fifth stage. When you repeatedly come and go, and transcend it, you begin to witness these outgoings and incomings, the meditative and non-meditative state of mind.

When you start observing it then there descends a Silent Awareness. When we become silently aware of it then comes the ultimate explosion. You go beyond 'Out and In'. That means you yourself go in the explosion.

Now, there is no recording because the mechanism has dissolved. This is the point of Nirvana Brahma-Upalabdhi, Moksha or whatever you call it. This has never been and cannot be recorded.

Y. K.: AFTER THIS, DOES ONE LIVE IN THE BODY?

Osho: Certainly, because the working of the body is another process. It is there of its own and has a process of its own. One can live on or one can go out of it. To us it seems that one lives in the house but for the resident, now there is no house.

Y. K.: BUT THERE IS THE BODY'?

Osho: There is the body. But not as we feel it. The whole universe becomes the body.

Y. K.: BUT THERE IS STILL AN INDIVIDUAL BODY?

Osho: No, no. This is all for us. This fifth stage, whenever we talk about it becomes a puzzle. So. it can never be explained.

Y. M.: SO, IN THE FIFTH STAGE THERE IS THE EXPLOSION OF INDIVIDUAL AWARENESS, OR WHAT YOU CALL IT?

Osho: Explosion of everything, and of the total, that you were--your memory, intellect, ego. personality, your being and your soul. Everything that you were is not so now. You just go beyond. There is no You. You become everything. That is the point. of Brahman, Cosmic Consciousness.

The method and guidance can lead you upto Satori only, upto the fourth stage. The fifth is beyond any method only. That Silent Awareness is always beyond guidance. Either it happens or it does not happen.

Y. M.: IN THIS EXPLOSION, IS ONE AWARE OF IT?

Osho: No, no. There is no question of awareness or non-awareness.

Buddha was asked many times repeatedly the same question everyday:--'What happens of the Enlightened Person? Where does he go? Whether he exists or not?' And he said. "It is irrelevant. Do not ask". He categorised eleven questions which must not be asked. And this question was one of them. Not that Buddha did not know, but because any type of statement was hound to create new puzzles.

Y. M.: WHAT IS THE MISSION OF LIFE?

Osho: No, no. No mission.

Y. M.: NOT FOR AN INDIVIDUAL. IN GENERAL, WHEN WE ARE LIVING IN THIS WORLD AND HAVE TO DO SO MANY THINGS WE HAVE TO UNDERGO MANY CHANGES SOMETIMES WE ARE DOING YOGA, SOMETIMES THIS TYPE OF DISCIPLINE, SOMETIMES THAT TYPE OF METHOD. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE? CAN ANYONE SOLVE THIS MYSTERY? ULTIMATELY, WHY ARE WE DOING ALL THESE THINGS?

Osho: Well, when you say it is a mystery, then it cannot be solved and if it can be solved then it will not be a mystery. It is a mystery. And there is no mission because in a mystery there can be no mission. There can be no purpose in a mystery. There can just be a playfulness, leela. So, this whole existence is just a 'playfulness' of the energy that which is of the existential energy. It is just a play of it--this whole creation. And play means something which is purposeless, every act is the achievement.

So, life has no mission because living itself is the achievement. You live in many ways--that too is the outflow of energy--this purposeless Cosmic Play. It is purposeless, that is why it is a mystery. But the West could never conceive it as purposeless, that is why the West could never achieve a religious mind. It seems nonsense. It is nonsense, But the East could conceive and see sense in nonsense, could see no purpose having its own purpose, having its own intrinsic value. 'Life Is'. that is all. Existence is. It is enough. Why ask for more? How can there be anything more than Existence? And when you come to the fourth stage, this feeling begins to dawn upon you in Satori. Life becomes a play that is why Zen monks are gay and not serious.

A serious person means a person who has not felt the miraculous, the mysterious. So a serious person can never be religious. At the fourth stage, at the Satori stage of mind, you become playful. So, a Zen monk can laugh at the Buddha. So beautiful! So beautiful!! It has never been achieved anywhere else.

Y. M.: BUT PEOPLE ARE AFRAID TO COME TO THIS STATE BECAUSE THEY KNOW IT WILL DISTURB THE PATTERN OF SOCIETY.

Osho: It disturbs, because the Society is created by 'seriousness--diseased' people and everything has been demarcated. But Life manages itself, man has never managed it. Those who have tried to manage it, have done nothing but killed it. Life is so forceful that it manages itself. Do not manage it. Who are you to manage it? It is Life that is managing itself howsoever you may try.

M.Y.B.: SHOULD THIS EXPERIMENT GO TO THE PEAK?

Osho: Yes. It must go to the peak. You must go mad completely, only then the sanity will come.

LSD

LSD or any other chemical drug, is nothing but a help to make the mind more projective. All the hindrances, all the ordinary hindrances are withdrawn. The ordinary reason and conscious mind are withdrawn. You are completely in the hold of the unconscious. But the unconscious itself will not bring Samadhi through LSD. It can only be possible if the unconscious has been fed with conceptions, colours and vital experiences. Everything that has been put into it can be projected.

LSD can only be a help to project, whatsoever is in the seed form of your unconsciouS mind. If it is love, then love will be projected--if it is hatred, then hatred will be projected LSD is an expanding drug, whatsoever is in the seed form will be expanded into a tree.

At night you dream because the conscious barriers are withdrawn. So whatever in your mind is suppressed. desired, longed for, begins to take shape and form and begins to be imagined. But when you are in a dream, you never know that it is a dream. It is so life-like, it is so real. LSD is a chemical way of dreaming.

So you can see things which you have never seen. know things that you have not known, realise things that you have never realised. But all these realisations are only apparent realisations. They are not real. They are beautiful, they have their own charm just like nice dreams. But LSD can project a nightmare also. It depends on you, not on LSD. If your mind is hallucinated and is suffering from some untoward images, these will be projected. So there are persons. Meditation will be a tame thing in comparison because it is real. It is not a dreamland. The progress is step by step. It is not so sudden.

So in LSD the thing is sudden. It is so sudden that it overwhelms you. It shatters your total memory. All the tensions are non-existential for the moment. You are relaxed and the cosmic harmony is felt. The barriers are not there. You don't exist as an I; and the world and you have become one. This is so sudden and blissful that you will have a cherished memory of it afterwards.

You must reach the door of Samadhi completely empty handed, naked, vacant, only then the authentic thing happens. Otherwise, you are meditating with the projections. You have been projecting in meditation, and you have been projecting in your LSD experiences. Both are projections.

In LSD you go nowhere, you are just where you were. Something happens to you because of chemical changes; because your ordinary mind is not functioning. It has been defunctioned. The ordinary reasoning, the ordinary checks are numbed. They are put off and the unconscious is put on. This has been done through a chemical agent. You are not the controller but the chemical agent is the controller. You are under its influence. You are not a free agent--now LSD is free in you and LSD will work something in you. It is not that you are working but you are being worked upon and something will happen to you--not that you have happened to something--you have jumped, you have encountered, you have gone! You are not where You were. You have changed. This change is a conscious change. with full awareness; and the change is your effort. Because you have done it, you have travelled, you have gone to some peak, you can be on the Everest.

Early Talks